

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Communication Studies Theses, Dissertations,
and Student Research

Communication Studies, Department of

4-2010

Counter-Mapping as Place-Framing: Naturalized Injustice, De-Naturalized Community and Organizing for Social Change on Google Earth

Joshua P. Ewalt

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, joshua.ewalt3@huskers.unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/commstuddiss>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Ewalt, Joshua P., "Counter-Mapping as Place-Framing: Naturalized Injustice, De-Naturalized Community and Organizing for Social Change on Google Earth" (2010). *Communication Studies Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research*. 4.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/commstuddiss/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Communication Studies, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Studies Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

COUNTER-MAPPING AS PLACE-FRAMING: NATURALIZED INJUSTICE, DE-
NATURALIZED COMMUNITY, AND ORGANIZING FOR SOCIAL CHANGE ON
GOOGLE EARTH

by

Joshua P. Ewalt

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Major: Communication Studies

Under the Supervision of Professor Kristen Lucas

Lincoln, Nebraska

April, 2010

COUNTER-MAPPING AS PLACE-FRAMING: NATURALIZED INJUSTICE, DE-
NATURALIZED COMMUNITY, AND ORGANIZING FOR SOCIAL CHANGE ON
GOOGLE EARTH

Joshua Ewalt, M.A.

University of Nebraska, 2010

Advisor: Kristen Lucas

In this thesis, I perform an analysis of counter-mapping on Google Earth as a process of organizing for social change. I address the process of mapping the virtual earth as an act of place-framing, an organizing process by which space is transformed to place so as to motivate action on the part of current and potential organizational adherents. Specifically, I argue that there are at least two ways in which place is framed on Google Earth so as to motivate action: place as “naturalized injustice” and place as “de-naturalized community.” Using the analytical vocabulary of collective action framing, and Martin’s (2003) extension of this vocabulary to the creation of place, I claim that the meanings of place are organized around diagnostic, prognostic and motivational themes. After illustrating these two place-frames, I suggest that the naturalized injustice frame may be a problematic place-based organizing process as it relies on the dominant hegemonic ideologies of globalization; namely, that certain localities will inevitably benefit from the transnational flow of symbols and capital. Thus, I argue that the de-naturalized community place-frame may be the more appropriate use of place for organizing against unchecked, free-market behaviors (in this case, mountaintop removal)

“from below” as it offers *place* as a resistant geography to the encroachment of global *space*. Furthermore, I argue that this case of counter-mapping on Google Earth, and its framing of place, presents two dialectical tensions of organizing: reliance upon objective and subjective views of the landscape and the portrayal of people-in-place as victims or agents for social change. I conclude by providing some questions and issues that arose during the analysis dealing with unexpected ethical issues and concerns over the importance of public memory to organizing processes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank, first and foremost, my advisor Dr. Kristen Lucas. Dr. Lucas provided a very strong source of guidance throughout the project. Particularly, I thank her for her willingness to read the initial unorganized and abstract ideas for this thesis with unending patience, finding ways to eventually present the ideas with clarity and focus. I can honestly say, without her help, I would not be composing this statement for the finished product. I would also like to thank Dr. Krone for her commitment to organizing for social change, which is a perspective that guided every nerve of this thesis and her helpful comments during the prospectus meeting. Thirdly, I would like to thank Dr. Japp for helping develop my interests in space and place and for always forcing me to recognize there are things I have left unsaid/undiscovered, and, as a scholar, to be okay with such incompleteness. I am still, and will always, be working on accomplishing that task. Lastly, I would like to thank the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for offering a comfortable and challenging intellectual home throughout the completion of this master's degree.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Google Earth as a Unique Medium.....	5
Google Earth as a Unique Tool for Organizing: The Outreach Collective.....	8
Google Earth as Offering a Unique Set of Counter-Mapping Texts	10
Google Earth, Communication Studies, and Place	13
Summary and Overview of the Thesis.....	15
Chapter Two: Organizational Communication, Social Change, and Place	18
Organizational Communication and Globalization	19
The Context of Globalization.....	19
Globalized Organizing Research in Organizational Communication.....	22
Place-Making and Organizing	26
Sense of Place: Fully Experienced Place	28
Place and Organizing Collective Action.....	29
Organizing for Social Change and Dialectical Tensions	31
Chapter 3: Analyzing Counter-Mapping Organizational Discourses on Google Earth:	
Critical Framework and Texts	35
Cases and Texts Used for Analysis.....	35
The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	36
The Maps of USHMM.....	36
Appalachian Voices	38
The Maps of Appalachian Voices.....	39

Analytical Framework	39
Collective Action Framing.....	40
Analyzing Collective Action Framing	41
The Place-Frame: Using Place for Collective Action.....	43
Re-thinking the Place-Frame	45
The Place-Frame and Dialectics	46
Chapter 4: The “Naturalized Injustice” and “De-Naturalized Community”	
Place-Frames.....	48
Naturalizing Injustice: The Maps of the <i>USHMM</i>	49
Diagnostic Place-Framing.....	49
Diagnosing Injustice on the World is Witness Map	50
Diagnosing the Crisis in Darfur	54
Prognostic Features of the Naturalized Injustice: Global Interference	60
Prognostic Framing of the World is Witness.....	60
Prognostic Framing of the Crisis in Darfur.....	67
Motivational Features of the Naturalized Injustice Frame: Witnessing	69
First Dimension of Witnessing: Global Responsibility	72
Second Dimension of Witnessing: Empathy for the Victim.....	74
Overall Use of Place by USHMM	76
The “De-Naturalized Community” Place-Frame: <i>Appalachian Voices</i>	78
Diagnosing Place-Frame	79

Prognostic Place-Frame	86
Motivational Framing: Everyone in Place	91
Implicating the Outsider: Physical and Emotional Connection.....	92
Reinforcing the Insider: Competing Place-Meanings.....	96
Overall Use of Place by Appalachian Voices	98
The Dialectical Tensions of Place and Google Earth	100
The Objectivity/Subjectivity of Place	100
The Victimization/Agency Dialectic	104
Conclusion	106
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Directions for Future Research	108
Theoretical Implications	109
Directions for Future Research	111
Ethical Questions	111
Dialectical-Based Theory.....	112
Memory-Based Research.....	113
Research on Google Earth	114
Place and Organizing for Social Change	115
Practical Contributions.....	116
References.....	122
Notes	123

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

“And this gets to the very heart of what mapmaking is all about: Creating a map means ignoring everything in the world but that one thing. And that thing could be bus routes, or the air traffic control patterns, it could be the homes of Hollywood stars, or it could be the cracks in the sidewalk. Maps have meaning because they filter out all the chaos in the world and focus obsessively on one item.”

- Ira Glass (1998) from *This American Life*

“One might speculate that databases – as part of a larger body often called new media – are providing an emerging rhetoric regarding how to map space as well as how to move through places”

- Jeff Rice (2008) from *Urban Mappings: A Rhetoric of the Network*

We live in a map-immersed world. A plethora of maps surround at any given moment. So common is their existence, they often go unnoticed by the casual human observer (Wood, 1992). Road maps help us find a new school or restaurant, a concert venue, or an auto shop. Weather maps inform us about climate and storm patterns across geographies and city maps give insight into crime patterns. Around election time, political maps construct “blue states” and “red states.” Tourist maps rhetorically construct certain spaces as exotic and unique and help us situate our bodies within these visitor-friendly spaces, meanwhile facilitating a colonialist construction of the identities of those hosts who actually live in the exotic spaces (Del Casino & Hanna, 2000). With each of these cases, it is clear that the maps encountered in our everyday lives are used to both navigate and politically construct the spaces and *places* within which human beings reside. In “focusing obsessively on one item,” to use Glass’s (1998) words, maps are powerful because they have the ability to organize geographies around any given theme.

Recently, certain maps have been used to organize geographies around themes of injustice, oppression, or political resistance. These maps, often called counter-maps or participatory cartography (Bauer, 2008; Hodgson & Schroder, 2002; Wainwright & Bryan, 2009), are used by a loosely organized collection of social movement organizations (SMOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and even some government entities to resist social, economic, or global oppression. Considered a part of the counter-mapping movement (i.e. Hodgson & Schroder, 2002; Wainwright & Bryan, 2009), these organizations use a multitude of cartographies -- from physical maps to simulations of built environments on virtual worlds -- in order to construct *place* -- the experience of space in all of its emotional, affectionate, historical, and/or cultural dimensions -- for organizing collective action. This use of counter-mapping works from the recognition that battles over injustice are now battles over the locational politics of place. In that sense, Keith and Pile (1993a), following Jameson (1991), get to the heart of the counter-mapping movement when they state:

It is...meant to allow people to become aware of their own position in the world, and to give people the resources to resist and make their own history.

It is the logic of capital itself which produces an uneven development of space. These spaces need to be 'mapped,' so that they can be used by oppositional culture and new social movements against the interests of capital as sites of resistance." (p. 3)

In a global world, where places of oppression are increasingly difficult to locate (Harvey, 1993; Lefebvre, 1991), maps help us locate a place of resistance and allow us to link that

place to similarly oppressed sites. That is, counter-maps, in defining places of oppression, have the ability to network our place to other places around that one common theme of collective resistance.

Contemporary examples of counter-mapping abound: Maya and Mayangna communities in Nicaragua and Belize, for instance, have used maps to facilitate reasoning and construct evidence in human rights lawsuits (Wainwright and Bryan, 2009). The *Pluto Project* subversively mapped post-cold war landscapes in order to illustrate unchecked state control and to “create awareness about injustice in the power of states and to promote peace” (Barney, 2009, p. 418). The *Pluto Project* also ironically mapped the Eastern landscape from the perspective of unchecked global democracy (Barney, 2009). Indigenous groups in Venezuela have utilized cartographies to construct counter-hegemonic political borders to re-gain control of their natural resources (Sletto, 2009). All of these examples illustrate how different places are constructed and networked by focusing on one item that can counteract dominant rationalities.

Perhaps the most prominent site of counter-mapping is Google Earth. Facilitated by the financial and educational resources of Google Earth Outreach – the division of Google Earth concerned with utilizing its software for socially conscious purposes – a number of organizations have begun mapping organizational initiatives and social injustices on a virtual image of the Earth. For instance, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (2009) states, “[USHMM] uses tools such as Google Earth and animated maps to enable citizens to understand Holocaust history and bear witness to current threats of genocide across the globe.” The World Wildlife Fund (WWF)

highlights the importance of creating maps that allow Google Earth users to view the mission, goals, and identity of its organization:

With more than 45 years of on-the-ground experience, WWF is excited that people everywhere will have the opportunity to zoom in on a sample of our projects and gain a better understanding of just how big the conservation challenge is and some of the things we are doing to address it...users of Google Earth will be able to learn about the geographical location of selected WWF projects, read a description of each and be directed to WWF's global website." (Malone, 2007)

These examples represent the use of Google Earth for counter mapping organizing. In using the global media resources offered by Google Earth Outreach, they are able to associate imagery, narratives, and videos with geographies to create places of oppression and resistance. Certainly, as maps, they attempt to "filter out all the chaos" of the global world and "focus obsessively" on one component of place, "mapping" the ideologies of a landscape. Just how the mapping is constructed by organizations and how effectively it plays out in global organizing efforts, however, needs further analysis.

In this thesis, the counter-maps produced on Google Earth are the central object of study. Specifically, I perform an analysis of counter-mapping on Google Earth as a process of organizing for social change. I argue the process of mapping the virtual earth is an act of place-framing, an organizing process by which space is transformed to place so as to motivate action on the part of current and potential organizational adherents. Using the analytical vocabulary of collective action framing, and Martin's (2003)

extension of this vocabulary to the creation of place, I suggest that there are at least two ways in which place is framed on Google Earth so as to motivate action: place as “naturalized injustice” and place as “de-naturalized community.” Each of these frames, I argue, may be more or less useful to presenting global resistance “from below.” Finally, I suggest that this case of counter-mapping on Google Earth, and its framing of place, presents at least two dialectical tensions of organizing: reliance upon objective and subjective views of the landscape (objective/subjective dialectic) and the portrayal of people-in-place as victims or agents for social change (victimization/agency dialectic).

There are a few terms, concepts, scholarly traditions, and objects of study related to this argument that need further explanation in this introductory chapter. That is, approaching Google Earth as a site of counter-mapping from a “place-based” and “organizing” approach requires not only an explanation of these concepts, but also requires a more detailed explanation of Google Earth and reasons for its analysis. In offering an argument for the novelty of addressing Google Earth, counter-mapping and organizing for social change, I hope to also briefly introduce the important strands of information necessary to understand Google Earth, place, and organizing on its database. This will be divided into four themes: Google Earth (1) as a unique medium, (2) as a unique site of global organizing for social change, (3) as offering a rich set of counter-mapping texts, and (4) as connecting organizing and place.

Google Earth as a Unique Medium

First, Google Earth and the global collective associated with its Outreach organization, represent a strong site of study for they offer insight into the utility of a

truly unique medium for organizing purposes. Google Earth began as a project called *Earth Viewer* created and released by Keyhole as a user friendly GIS-like mapping device. In 2004, Google purchased Keyhole's *Earth Viewer* and transformed the project into what we now know as Google Earth (Dicum, 2007). Google Earth functions by way of layering satellite imagery on three dimensional maps of the earth, allowing a person to look at photographic images taken at various coordinates throughout the world. The imagery viewed on Google Earth is a real-time account of topographic landscape as satellites direct images to the user's computer screen. Users can view their homes, their cars, the places in which they work, their favorite vacation destination, and so forth, all from a bird's eye perspective. The medium provides still-life, but frequently updated images of geographies throughout the world. Indeed, there is not a place on earth one is unable to view from her or his computer screen. Recently, mostly in the United States (though beginning to infect more of Europe as well), Google Earth has incorporated the "street view." As it sounds, Google cars drive around public streets and take photographs of city streets and residential homes. These images are then presented on the database in three-dimensional format so users can virtually enter the photographs and travel the city streets. This allows virtual inhabitants of Google Earth to "fly" to and "zoom" in on a number of experiential landscapes, placing their virtual perception and subject position within particular geographic localities. Thus, from the view of earth from space to the city street down the road, Google Earth allows real-time surveillance of multi-national virtual spatiality.

At certain lengths, the landscape on Google Earth looks eerily similar to the view from outside of an airplane. Sutko (2007) relays the story well:

A few weeks ago, I was flying to visit some friends, and on the plane with me were two teenagers excitedly and loudly anticipating their first flight.

With a clear sky and mild weather, it was a perfect day for flying: good news for these teens, I thought. As the plane took off, I heard one of these novice travelers remark to the other, Whoa it looks just like Google Earth!” (p. 56)

Certainly this was, as Sutko (2007) mentions, a case of Baudrillardian reversal, wherein the representation becomes the reality. And it is not just the perception of these spawns of the postmodern world riding on the plane. Instead, it truly is the case that through its simulation of flying, and its strikingly realistic (re)presentations, Google Earth is the real. Its spatiality is more than just objective presentation of the earth’s surface. Google Earth, despite its seeming absurdity and strikingly unique character, has something inherently believable about it.

Thus, the medium of Google Earth is strikingly unique. In focusing on the counter-mapping initiatives taking place on its database, the case is worthy of analysis for it offers the potential to understand the utility of a highly unique, surveillance-based tool for organizing purposes. It is also a medium that has seen very little analysis (for a few representative analyses see Kingsbury, & Jones, 2009; Parks, 2009). This thesis, then, in taking Google Earth as the central concern, should lend insight into the usefulness or lack thereof regarding using surveillance technology for organizing purposes.

Google Earth as a Unique Tool for Organizing: The Outreach Collective

Not only does Google Earth lend insight into the use of an interesting medium, it also offers a unique chance to understand the rhetorical practices of a global organizing collective that converges on the space of its database: the different work of a number of organizations working with Google Earth Outreach. Google Earth Outreach provides necessary information to groups attempting to map their own destruction, oppression, or efforts at social change on Google Earth. Since 2007, Google Earth Outreach has worked with various organizations to present movement material to audiences in distant places. It provides free online tutorials and case studies so groups can utilize the power of virtual earth software. This division of the organization also provides grants to these groups when the access to the technology may not be available. Furthermore, Google Earth Outreach works with well-established political entities to aid in the promotion of their organizations and causes. This organizational structure, designed to aid organizations in their mapping of local destruction and oppression is further supported by the policy wherein Google Earth allows its workers to spend a fifth of their time on Google Earth-related side projects of their choice. This policy resulted in an informal liaison between Google Earth Outreach and the environmentalist community (Dicum, 2007). The organization has also been vital to promoting the use of Google Earth by educators, a use which has been highly praised by the educators themselves (Butler, 2007; D'Agnese, 2007; Lund, & Macklin, 2007). Overall, the Outreach program and its employees serve as the central organizing locus for a cooperative that resembles a sub-movement within the broader counter-mapping movement and the even broader "globalization from below" –

that organizing which attempts to counteract globalized spaces from “above” with a number of rhetorical practices that focus on “local,” place-based issues from “below” (Ganesh, Zoller, & Cheney, 2005). Thus, this site of analysis offers not only insight into a unique medium, but also insight into a global collective attempting to organize for social change.

Certainly, focusing on global collective organizational action is at the forefront of trends in organizational communication research. Recently, organizational communication has moved away from traditional sites of analysis such as the workplace and has included analyses of social movement organizing activity (Eltantawy, 2008; Ganesh, Zoller, & Cheney, 2005). This move has incorporated a much stronger emphasis on the critical analysis of organizational discourses. As Meisenbach, Remke, Buzzanell, and Liu (2008) state, critical scholars can help analyze the means by which ideology and resistance are perpetuated by organizational discourse. Much of this work, which broadens the boundaries of organizational communication, has used insights from rhetorical criticism (e.g. Hogler, Gross, Hartman, & Culiffe, 2008; Sillince, 2006), applying a critical analysis to both micro and macro resistance (Eltantawy, 2008; Ganesh et al., 2005). As Crable (1990) says, “whatever else they are, organizations are inherently rhetorical” (p. 115). Furthermore, much discourse-oriented research is going beyond the rigid view of organizations and focusing on a more fluid view of “organizing” as the objective of communicative analysis. Organizing allows us to see the goal of collective action discourses as meaning-centered and as a constantly evolving process, whereby

resources, identities, and meanings are collectively united for a common goal (Papa, Singhal, & Papa, 2006).

Thus, Google Earth and its Outreach organization offer a site of analysis that expands the often workplace-specific studies of organizational communication to include global collective action organizations and their strategic organizing discourses. The maps produced by these organizations and their members may provide clear insight into discourses for organizing processes on a global medium. In focusing on strategy and discourse, one should also hope that Google Earth is a rational site of analysis in that it offers resources for examining the texts and discourses of a diverse set of global organizations.

Google Earth as Offering a Unique Set of Counter-Mapping Texts

In addition to offering the potential to think about utilizing surveillance-based media for social change, and allowing insights into a unique global organizing collective that helps extend the boundaries of organizational communication to include analyses of alternative organizational discourses, Google Earth also offers a unique set of counter-mapping texts. The texts are unique in that they take the virtual surveyed earth and apply stories, photographs, videos and other texts that make up their organizational discourse to the landscapes and localities with which they are concerned. Google Earth, as a medium, offers the potential, with the help of the resources offered by Google Earth Outreach, to reinvent SMO messages in decidedly geographical forms of argument.

A few extended examples of the initiatives supported by this sub-movement provide testimony to the enthusiasm with which organizations take advantage of Google

Earth Outreach's organizing (mapping) resources. According to Dicum (2007), the Sierra Club was one of the first environmental organizations to use Google Earth, creating a map of various threats to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Furthermore, Dicum (2007) tells the story of Rebecca Moore, head of the Outreach program, who has utilized the user-friendly database to map destructive logging in the Pacific Northwest:

Late in 2005, Rebecca Moore was giving a presentation to a community group concerned about the proposed logging in the Santa Cruz Mountains, south of San Francisco. In the darkened room, a large screen displayed an image of the earth floating serenely in space. Moore touched a key on her computer and the planet expanded to fill the screen and as the view zoomed closer still, more than 300 audience members were able to make out the California coastline, then their own region. The landscape tilted, and the flat imagery leaped up to form mountains and valleys. Finally, they could see detailed three-dimensional satellite images of the redwood-covered ridges above their homes. Moore touched another key and added an overlay of the proposed logging plan. The audience gasped..." (p. 58)

While Moore's example is a representation of individuals utilizing the medium to promote less well-established organizations, further examples exist as evidence of mapping initiatives designed to facilitate successful advocacy for established organizations looking to map their objectives. For instance, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has worked with Google Earth to promote the cause of refugee aid:

Every year, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees gives assistance and shelter to millions of people forcibly uprooted from their homes. Some of them have lived in camps or ghettos for up to 20 years. The upcoming World Refugee Day on 20th June is an important opportunity for everybody to show solidarity.

Marie is a Burundian refugee in Rwanda. As a member of the Tutsi ethnic group, she and her family were attacked by Hutu rebels on several occasions. Now she and her family are waiting to be resettled; as she says, “I plan to work and start my life with my family. It’s the most precious dream I have...to see them again.”

Together with Google, UNHCR is putting refugees on the map – a virtual map – with a new Google Earth tour that shows UNHCR’s refugee camps across the globe. Claudia Gonzalez-Gisiger from UNHCR says the tour is a powerful way for everyone to get an insight into the desperate conditions in which refugees live” (Anderson & Lamy, 2009).

These are just a few examples of the many projects co-designed by social justice organizations, or what Routledge and Cumbers (2009) title “global justice networks” and Google Earth Outreach to collectively engage in the promotion of environmental and human justice on a decidedly geographical and global database.

And the specific mapping texts extend beyond that. Appalachian Voices applies videos of local people affected by mountaintop removal to the specific locations and mountains that have been blown apart for coal mining purposes. The United States

Holocaust Memorial Museum takes facts about villages burned in Darfur and links them to the specific sites where those villages used to reside before they were plumaged.

Women for Women International take specific stories of women and attach them to a diverse array of global spaces, creating a network of places themed on the issue of global justice for women. GreenPeace uses videos and photographs to link their top environmental concerns to the places most threatened by global climate change and other forms of natural resource destruction. Thus, Google Earth does offer unique insight into a diversity of global, organizational discourses that collectively seek to highlight place-based issues.

Google Earth, Communication Studies and Place

Thus, Google Earth allows for research that analyzes a unique medium with a uniquely accessible global organizing collective and which presents a unique set of texts as examples of SMO organizing discourses. As such, it presents a rationale for study based on advances in the research on new media and organizational communication as concerned with issues and organizations beyond the workplace. However, because Google Earth is unique *geographically* as a communication medium, it also allows one to expand upon the theoretical and practical links between critical geography and communication studies.

Central to understanding Google Earth as a site that facilitates research between these two disciplinary traditions involves recognizing the nature of *place*. Place is often defined as a geographical term distinguished from the related term, space. For Tuan (1976; 1979), space refers to the endless, vast freedom of movement, the lack of

“rootedness” felt when one encounters an external world free from herself. Place, on the other hand, is security, the place of “rootedness” where one’s personal and ancestral history have tied her to a geographical location. Tuan (1976) claims “Place is security; space is freedom: we are attached to the one and long for the other” (p. 3). While places represent security in the sense that they function as “centers of felt value where biological needs, such as those for food, water, rest and protection, are satisfied” (Tuan, 1976, p. 4), place also may evoke an affectionate security, allowing humans to “root” themselves. By attaching an identity to a particular location, that individual is locating a geographic home for his or her sense of being, belonging and self. In short, “place incarnates the experiences and aspirations of a people. Place is not only a fact to be explained in the broader frame of space, but it is also a reality to be clarified and understood from the perspectives of the people who have given it meaning” (Tuan, 1979, p. 387). In simple terms, place is space combined with human meaning. It is always constituted in the various discourses of individuals, media, and, in the case of this thesis, organizations using counter-maps on Google Earth for facilitating collective action.

Mapping, in fact, is unique as it networks a number of different places along a common theme. In creating a map of different places, those places become connected on Google Earth to provide an overall vision of the local. This may be important to a deeply global world as place has become increasingly contentious, complicated and (re)assembled by the hand of capitalism (Wright, 2008). Thus, as an inherently geographical medium that offers counter-mapping texts that actually allow the individual to move within the sites being mapped, Google Earth allows one to truly see the means

by which maps create and connect places as a frame for the local and its attendant action. While approaching Google Earth may seem like the ultimate experience with traversable space, counter-maps can direct that movement in place-based terms. In doing so, it should allow for theoretical and practical connections between the study of organizing and the human construction of place.

Summary and Overview of Thesis

In this chapter, I introduced the subject of study and provided a rationale for studying it. In explaining the various features of Google Earth as a medium, as well as the organizing activities that occur around it, I made the case that analyzing Google Earth, Google Earth Outreach and the organizations performing counter-mapping activities is worthy of study for a number of reasons. First, I suggested that it presents a scholar with a highly unique medium of global surveillance that, in and of itself, has seen very little analyses. Second, it offers a unique site of global collective organizing often not present on one site, one convergent space, as it presents the counter-mapping discourses of a number of different, geographically disperse organizations. Finally, I suggested that because Google Earth is such a geographically-oriented medium, it presents the possibility for analyzing complex relationships between critical geography and communication studies, particularly developing the relationship between recent work in organizational communication on SMOs and other non-traditional organizations and the use of place as more than just a context within which organizing occurs, but in and of itself as an organizing construct. Thus, if I am focusing on the movement of organizational communication into non-traditional organizations, on a global new

medium, and how place is used as an organizing construct on that medium, I need to situate this case within two strains of research: alternative (global) organizational communication studies and place.

In Chapter 2, I situate this case study within the appropriate literature on organizing for social change, organizing during globalization, and the use of place as an organizing resource particularly during globalization. Working from this position, I present two research questions that I use to open up further questions regarding using place and Google Earth for organizing strategy. The two questions will allow me to address the specific organizational discourses that use counter-mapping strategies on Google Earth in association with Google Earth Outreach.

In Chapter 3, I outline the texts and analytic framework. I first detail the specific organizations under analysis. I also indicate the specific texts I will use for addressing their organizational discourses. I then outline my analytical framework, which is a globalized, dialectical version of the place-frame. Because I am concerned with both organizing for social change and the construction of place as a tool for conducting that organizing, I need a framework that will specifically allow me to get to the heart of these two issues. Because place-framing works from the critical tools and vocabulary presented in the research on collective action framing, while still attending to the rhetorical construction of place as an organizing phenomenon, it is the appropriate framework. However, I argue that when analyzing the place-frame I am also concerned with the tensions that inform the framing as well as the extent to which place-framing “weaves” places together on a global network.

In Chapter 4, I answer these questions by reading the geography-based organizational discourses from the perspective of the place-frame. I focus on the means by which place is framed for collective action and used as a strategy for resistance. Yet, I also attend to the inherent tensions that inform the frames and the use of Google Earth. I present the results organized around two place-frames – the “naturalizing injustice” and the “de-naturalized community” place-frames. These are described through the conventional features of collective action framing: the diagnostic, prognostic and motivational frames. I then use these results to discuss some possible tensions associated with this case of organizing. Specifically, I argue that there are at least two main tensions related to this use of counter-mapping: “the objective and subjective perception of place” and the “victimization/agency” of people-in-place.

Finally, in Chapter 5, I address the contributions and implications of this study for the goals and practices of organizing for social change, particularly during a period of deep globalization. First, I illustrate how I have hoped to expand upon existing research. Second, I illustrate the theoretical questions yet to be explained. Finally, I address practical contributions. In other words, How does what I have analyzed with this case help us understand how place can be used for mobilizing action in a global world?

CHAPTER TWO: ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION, SOCIAL CHANGE AND PLACE

Literature on organizing for social change, from the perspective of organizational communication, is slowly growing more diverse. Organizational communication used to be almost entirely concerned with questions of the workplace, addressing a multitude of questions about leadership, management, or processes of promoting identification (Ganesh et al., 2005). If organizational communication scholars were interested with power or resistance, the traditional terms of critical theory, it was mostly focused on processes of power within the traditional organization including concepts such as concertive control (Cheney, Christnsen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004), hegemonic identification discourses (Kyomiya, 2007), (un)ethical socialization rhetorics (Pribble, 1990) or discursive closure (Deetz, 1992). Studies of resistance were mostly concerned with the means by which individuals cheated time, discursively resisted the dominant ideologies of the organization, or created networks to battle against organizational power (Ganesh et al., 2005). Still, as Ganesh et al. (2005) and Mumby and Stohl (2007) indicate, these studies still mostly conducted site-specific ethnographic analyses concerned with power and resistance in one organization.

However, increasingly organizational communication scholars are concerned with the process of organizing in non-traditional organizations (Eltantanwy, 2008; Papa et al., 2006). Scholars have begun to perform research on the labor movement (Cloud, 2005) or environmental movements (Norton, 2009) and other social change oriented organizations. Most recently, that research has been concerned with two trends that perfectly situate the

case of Google Earth, Google Earth Outreach and counter-mapping: globalization and dialectical tensions. In the following chapter, I draw research questions regarding Google Earth, counter-mapping and organizing for social change from these two traditions. When concerned with organizing during deep globalization, however, I state research on collective strategy needs to attend to the relationship between organizing and place-making processes.

Organizational Communication and Globalization

The Context of Globalization

First, this research is situated within increasing concerns over the role of organizational communication research during globalization. Without question, studies on globalization are increasing across disciplines. Transcending many disciplines, including communication studies (Ganesh et al., 2005; Shome & Hegde, 2002), cultural and postmodern theory (Appadurai, 1996; Jameson, 1991) critical management studies (Prasad, 2003) and many others, the implications of the transnational flow of symbols and material capital is currently a hot-button topic for a diversity of scholars. Within this work, globalization has been defined in many ways. According to Shome and Hegde (2002), globalization is a phenomenon that “produces a state of culture in transnational motion – flows of people, trade, communication, ideas, technologies, finance, social movements, cross-border movements and more” (p. 174). Applying a markedly geographic tone to the process, Waters (1995) suggests that globalization is “a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding” (p. 2 cf. Cheney,

Christensen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004, p. 380). Thus, at its core, globalization involves a dominant ideology that promotes the penetration of images, capital, media, and so forth, across national borders and which promotes geographical unification.

While there are a number of definitions and different disciplinary approaches to globalization, many scholars agree that the spread of multi-national capitalism results in a number of vital ramifications including increased divisions among social classes, environmental destruction, and an overall ideological colonization of social and national difference (Cloud, 2001; Jameson, 1991). As such, as Shome and Hegde (2002) indicate, following Appadurai (1996), globalization is not only a study of transnational culture but also a study of the “unequal transnational flows of capital and culture that precipitate new problems and planes of inequalities” (p. 174). Even the construction of knowledge cannot escape the concerns over globalization. The “Green Movement,” for instance, has been criticized for promoting a global rationality maintaining western definitions of rationality by “locating knowledge and skill in the institutions and experts of the west” (Wright, 2008, p. 410). Overall, globalization is a process that challenges and redefines the key concerns for critical scholars: identity, oppression, injustice and resistance. As such, it also redefines how organizations respond to its presence.

Thus, in response to these increasingly complex inequalities, loosely connected organizations, individuals, and protests collectively attempt to counteract the dominant forces that produce these complicated disjunctures. This “movement of movements” which attempts to rework the guiding ideology of globalization is variously titled the “Alternative Globalization Movement” (Osterweil, 2009) and “Globalization from

Below” (Ganesh et al., 2005). Following Brecher and Costellos (2000), Wright (2008) defines globalization from below as a process wherein “people at the grassroots around the world link up to impose their own needs and interests on the process of globalization” (p. 410). Globalization from below, then, represents a collective resistance, often enacted through loosely organized, local, place-based organizing groups, against the overall ideological dominance of global capitalism and information media.

Most of the time, these movements and organizations are working against neo-liberal policies as evidenced by a number of recent protests in cities around the world including Seattle in 1999, Genoa in 2001 (Sandberg, 2006) and women’s protests in Argentina (Eltanaway, 2006). However, the movement against globalization is more complicated and often loosely organized than simply those organizations resisting the global flow of neo-liberal capital. Instead, globalization from below extends to a collection of local *place-based* movements that are not always as easily defined by their anti-neo-liberal status. Osmerweil (2009) explains:

While it is true that these movements’ most visible moments have been in opposition to transnational policies and the institutions that enforce neo-liberalism throughout the world, the various networks, movements and smaller events that lead up to and emerge from the summits cannot be discounted. These are themselves made up of a diverse mix of constituents and organizations that are not *obviously* oriented against what we might consider neo-liberal capitalist globalization. They range from environmental NGOs, to labor unions, political parties, neighborhood associations,

situationists, urban and rural squads, various affinity groups, artists, and myriad other subjects that have never before been considered, or considered themselves to be, part of one, global social movement” (p. 2).

Thus, the global social movement against globalization is more diverse than is noticeable at first. This leads Osterweil (2009) to suggest that “beyond the summits and social forums that are undeniably critical moments within this movement of movements, lie multiple webs of specific place-based struggles...that only in their heterogeneous and disparate totality comprise what is today called the Alternative Globalization Movement” (p. 2). In short, globalization from below is a complicated, often loosely networked, collection of organizing entities, that address a number of neoliberal, environmental and human rights issues or just attempt to reassert their view of local place in a global world.

Globalized Organizing Research in Organizational Communication

The diverse mix of organizations making up globalization from below, or just affected by the process of global development, provide a rich opening for organizational communication research to expand beyond studies of individual resistances and workplace-specific analyses of power (Ganesh et al., 2005). Quite recently, however, Ganesh et al. (2005) have argued that critical organizational communication researchers have maintained an extreme oversight with the lack of research on global social movement resistance. In Ganesh et al.’s (2005) call for a theorization of globalization from below, they state that “despite the furor over globalization, we find that communication scholars have not grappled with the full potential that globalization has to reconfigure our understanding of basic concepts that drive our research” and that the field

of critical organizational communication researchers have “largely ignored the opportunity to investigate collective resistance to power from the point of view of movements that work to resist and transform ideologies, practices and institutions that support and constitute neo-liberalism” (p. 170). Indeed, while research is beginning to pick up (for example, Ganesh, 2003), there is still a void of work on the processes of global collective action from the standpoint of organizational communication.

Ganesh et al. (2005) claim that scholars need to be “as grounded as possible in...understanding what practices constitute transformative aims” (p. 179). In order to do so, they argue that scholars of critical organizational communication attend to the specific symbolic and material dimensions that support global organizing efforts. Specifically, they state more research needs to be performed which asks “what norms, practices, structures and power relations are targeted by resistance efforts” as well as “To what degree does resistance provide the potential for disrupting hegemonic forces and systems?” (p. 180). In analyzing global organized resistance, organizational communication scholars can use their tools for understanding resistance beyond just the workplace and can specifically address the transformative potential of those movements on the global stage.

There is a slowly growing body of work in organizational communication studies that could be said to answer these calls. Some examples include Eltantawy’s (2008) analysis of organized protests in Argentina wherein she discusses the mobilization of public and private space for the appropriation of anti-neo-liberal messages and women’s rights. Cloud (2001) has continued to call for critical organizational communication

scholars to attend to the transformational power of labor movements during advanced global capitalism. Ganesh (2003) has addressed the transnational communication strategies of Indian NGOs, while Papa, Singhal, and Papa (2006) have offered an organizational communication-based account of a number of local, often anti-neo-liberal movement campaigns. Meanwhile, Zoller (2004) has critically analyzed the public discourse of the TransAtlantic Business Dialogue to understand their management of complicated global tensions. While it is not a study of globalization from below, per se, Zoller (2004) does highlight issues of globalization, protest, and ideological hegemony. Furthermore, Zoller's piece is useful in that it illustrates the ability to take a strong analytical framework common in organizational communication research (issues management) and apply it critically to the discursive construction of global power.

Despite these efforts, organizational communication research still, as Mumby and Stohl (2007) state, "focuses heavily on U.S.-based organizational contexts and are heavily skewed toward analyses of corporate firms" (p. 270). While disciplines outside of organizational communication have been considering transnational movements and globalization from below (e.g., Routledge, & Cumbers, 2009), organizational communication, as Ganesh et al. (2005) and Mumby and Stohl (2007) have pointed out, is just starting to find ways to appropriately deal with the tenants of organizing and globalization. While some work exists, there are still significant holes to be filled in the body of intellectual and empirical work.

One potential research direction may involve analyzing the relationship between place – the central concept of humanistic and critical geography – and global

organizational communication. That is, it may be important to address “place” as a locus of organized communicative action. A lack of research on this issue has persisted despite the fact that many globalization scholars, including those in other sub-disciplines of communication such as media and cultural studies, agree that the construction of place is at the forefront of understanding the effectiveness of global resistance (Grossberg, 1996; Shome & Hegde, 2002). Thus, scholars interested in contributing to research on the collective action strategies of global resistance produced when organizing for social change can contribute to the body of work by attending to the connections between critical geography and organizational communication, particularly as the creation of “place” figures into global organizing efforts. Indeed, as Routledge and Cumbers (2009) state:

Place, then, is important to sites of resistance, the creation of alternative knowledges and the interplay between local and global practices. Places comprise an interwoven web of specific symbolic meanings, communicative processes, political discourses, religious idioms, cultural practices, social networks, economic relations, physical settings, envisioned desires and hopes. Sensitivity to such processes when considering particular practices of resistances acknowledges the subjective nature of people’s perceptions, imaginations and experiences when they are involved in political action. It locates such action in dynamic spatial contexts, as *it sheds light upon how spaces are transformed into places redolent with cultural meaning, memory and identity under conditions of conflict*” (pp. 81-82, *emphasis added*).

Thus, in order to do as Ganesh et al. (2005) argue and “be as grounded as possible” in understanding the transformative potential of global organized movements, one important component of the effectiveness of that resistance will be how “spaces are transformed into places...under conditions of conflict.” To understand more about the transformation of place and its organizing potential, it is necessary to briefly attend to the work on “place-making.”

Place-Making and Organizing

While organizational communication has yet to offer an in-depth analysis of the importance of place to organizing efforts, one can look towards the research using place – defined in the first chapter as space experienced in all of its emotional, cultural, and historical dimensions – to understand the importance of place to organizing efforts. Specifically, it is important to recognize that transferring space to place and endowing it with human feeling is a decidedly rhetorical process. It involves language, symbol use, and an overall placement of meaning into the landscape. This is often titled the study of “place-making strategies” (Stewart & Dickinson, 2008). To study place-making is to address the means by which individuals and organizations take space and transform it into place “redolent with cultural meaning” (Routledge, & Cumbers, 2009). As Stewart and Dickinson (2008) state, “In real ways, place does not exist without the human efforts necessary to turn space into place” (p. 283).

A full review of the research on place and its rhetorical construction is beyond the scope of this thesis. It has been vital to research in geography (e.g. Buttimer, 1979), sociology (Alkon, & Traugot, 2008), and communication studies from both a social

scientific (Cantrill, 1998) and rhetorical perspective (Blair, & Michel, 1999; Hays, Hughes, & Tutton, 2004). In communication studies, most rhetorically-oriented scholars have been concerned with the use of place for directing public memory (Blair & Michel, 1999; Dickinson, 1997), rhetorical attention (Zagacki, & Gallagher, 2009) or promoting national identification (Clark, 2004). Oftentimes, one specific place is treated as rhetorical text to be read as a speech, book, or film might be approached. Specific places have included, among others, Old Pasadena (Dickinson, 1997), the Plains Indian Museum (Dickinson, Ott, & Akoi, 2006), the United States west coast (Lagkervist, 2008), and the Kent State Memorial (Weiss, 2008). Analytical methods involve, among others, narratives (Bird, 2002), and Burken frameworks (Clark, 2004). At their core, what all of these studies have in common is a recognition that place is more than just a context or background for action, but is in and of itself the locus of communicative and rhetorical strategy.

It is also worthwhile to mention that place and a sense of place have been mobilized beyond disciplinary boundaries of geography and communication studies. Many poets and literary critics have utilized or searched for a sense of place in the works of poetry and fiction. Loffreda (2007) addresses the sense of Laramie, Wyoming as a place in “coming-out” discourses after the Mathew Shepard murder, calling Laramie a “fitfully contradictory place, a place where forgetfulness and remembrance, othering and embrace, comingle” (p. 163). Quantic (1997) has undertaken a significant account of Great Plains fiction, addressing the narrative construction of a sense of place in the region. Quantic (1997) argues, “Great Plains writers often focus on the complex interplay

of place and society that arises from the dichotomy of attraction and repulsion...rife with examples of people transformed by their encounter with the land” (p. 9). Sakakibara (2008) has used place-making discourses as a framework for understanding climate change among Inupiat Tribes in Alaska.

Sense of Place: Fully Experienced Space

Useful to thinking about the function of place for organizing, there has been some research which illustrates the role a “sense of place” plays in one’s susceptibility to persuasive messages. Post (2008) claims that “one of the most important fields of humanistic cultural geography over the past 20 years has been the study of landscapes, their meanings, and their connection to our everyday lives, commonly called a ‘sense of place’” (p. 140). A working definition of the sense of place is contained in the work of Clay de Wit (1997) who wrote that the term refers to “the actual experience of place: physical, social, psychological, intellectual and emotional” (cf. Post, 2008, p. 140). Beyond this, a sense of place is something we can carry around with us in our orientation towards geographies. That is, in general, if one has a sense of place for a certain area it implies that individual has a positive affection towards the landscape, inscribed with family or cultural memories, or other experiences of “home.” Certainly, some research has shown that this can be a vital mediating feature of one’s willingness to adhere to environmental persuasive messages (Cantrill, 1998). However, the relevance of place-making and a sense of place to organizing efforts globally, or in multiple contexts of place-based injustice, have seen only minimal research.

Place as Organizing Collective Action

Certainly, while there is a hole in critical organizational communication addressing globalization from below that can be filled by research on place, there is also a hole in the work on place that needs to be filled by attending to place-making as an organizing strategy for collective resistance. There have only been a few examples of work addressing the means by which organizations can use their publications, discourses, and texts to create place out of space in such a way as to motivate collective action (Keith & Pile, 1993b; Martin, 2003). Keith and Pile (1993b), for instance, state that the Docks in London were created as a place that embodied a multitude of meanings necessary for labor disputes and class politics. Martin (2003), meanwhile, illustrates how neighborhood organizations in Minnesota were able to create place out of space in such a way as to motivate collective action on the part of local citizens for whom the neighborhood needed improvement. Her work briefly touched on the organizing potential of motivating a “sense of place.” On a broader scale, Said (2000) argues that the public memories and popular images associated with Israel can create a view of place that unites the west in problematic, colonialist ways. Finally, most related to this thesis, Gordon and Koo (2008) argue that views of virtual place can mobilize people to participate in democratic urban planning. However, none of these seriously attended to the research on organizational communication, globalization from below, or counter-mapping on Google Earth.

Advancing research on organizing during globalization by focusing on the organizing potential of local place is important as many scholars suggest our relationship to space and place is the fundamental oppressive quality of globalization (Castells, 2009;

Grossberg, 1996; Harvey, 1993; Jameson, 1991). As Shome and Hegde (2002) state, “Global relations of capital today are utilizing spaces and places in ways that produce complex planes of exclusion and inclusion, empowerment and disempowerment that cannot always be mapped...” (p. 176). As such, organizational communication scholars concerned with moving studies of resistance beyond the workplace and into the global arena, need to attend seriously to how place is constructed as a site of resistance, organizing, and motivation (or whether place is used for resistance at all and not constructed as a site collaborating with global development). That is, if place is space after it has been imbued with human meaning, what happens when collective global organizations imbue space with meanings that can help motivate action or pose resistant meanings to dominant rationalities, norms and practices? In other words, how can place be used as an organizing construct and rhetorical strategy? What happens, however, if organizations create and network local places in such a way as to promote global development?

Thus, working from literature that states organizational communication scholars need to attend to the complexities of global collective action, as well as research that suggests *place* may be a fundamental concern for organizing during deep globalization, I present my first research question. Counter-mapping, Google Earth, and the global organized collective working with Google Earth Outreach, offers the perfect opportunity to understand the means by which space may be turned into place for purposes of collective, global organized resistance. That is, the reasons Google Earth and counter-mapping are worthy of analysis is that they present a rich set of counter-mapping texts,

produced on a database that can present place-based information from across the entire global world. Thus, it offers a geographical medium, with the work of a number of globally-disperse organizations, all turning space into place on the virtual earth and networking those places through thematic maps of resistance. Thus, the object of study presents a strong opportunity to address the following question:

RQ1: How do the global counter-mapping organizations associated with Google Earth Outreach create place as a strategy for motivating and conducting collective action?

Addressing this question should not only lend insight into the strategies used to transform space to place for social resistance, but also may allow for insight into its transformative potential. As Ganesh et al. (2005) claim, we need to attend to the extent to which global organizing strategies can actually interrupt hegemonic processes. Hopefully, understanding strategies of constructing place for organizing will allow for practical conclusions regarding the effectiveness or lack thereof of those strategies.

Organizing for Social Change and Dialectical Tensions

While one concern for organizational communication scholars focusing on non-traditional organizational contexts has been, or increasingly will be, global collective action and its relationship to place, another prominent concern in organizational communication research is the paradoxes, or dialectical tensions, of organizing (Stohl, & Cheney, 2001). Currently, research that looks at organizing processes from the perspective of dialectical theory (i.e., Bakhtin, 1981) is growing. Dialectical theory presupposes that human interaction is guided by forces of competing tensions, such as

autonomy and togetherness or control and emancipation that simultaneously exist and must be managed by human symbol use. Papa, Singhal, and Papa (2006) furthermore define dialectics are characterized by four features: “contradiction, motion, totality and praxis” (p. 43). That is, dialectics are experiences in organizing that are characterized by opposite poles, the motion that occurs as individuals in the organized movement shift from pole to pole, the extent to which those poles are inherently influencing each other (one cannot exist without the other) and the extent to which human symbol use is capable of managing these tensions (Papa et al., 2006).

Many organizational scholars are concerned with paradoxes and dialectics in both traditional and nontraditional organizational contexts. For instance, Norton (2009) analyzes the means by which a resistant environmental movement, over a decade, slowly develops regimes of control. Norton’s (2009) piece is particularly useful as it illustrates the dialectic of control-resistance as it manifests itself diachronically. Gibbs (2009) has addressed the dialectics of inclusion-exclusion, empowerment-disempowerment, and autonomy-connectedness as they influence the symbolic interaction of virtual organizational teams. Galanes (2009) has addressed leadership from the perspective of dialectical theory, arguing not only is it the leader’s responsibility to manage precise group-level tensions, but also the leader him- or herself experiences such tensions as expression or silencing of leader voice or organizing group meetings from a structured yet improvisational stance. Quite prominently, Stohl and Cheney (2001) have suggested that participation in organizations is always characterized by tensions and paradoxes as the very act of mandating participation subverts democratic practices.

Specifically in terms of organizing for social change perhaps no treatise on organizational dialectics and paradoxes is more prominent than Papa et al.'s (2006) examination of the dialectics of social movement organizations. Working from a Bhaktinian (1981) conception of dialectics, Papa et al. (2006) have analyzed extensively the types of dialectical contradictions navigated by insurgent organizing for social change. They claim that all organizing efforts, working towards social change, are characterized by tensions. For instance, the authors outline the dialectic of control and emancipation, which involves holding simultaneously in mind contradicting ideas about emancipation, but arriving at this emancipation through a strict allegiance to control (Papa et al., 2006). They state that:

Organizing for social change efforts embody a dialectic tension between control and emancipation. The process of organizing for social change requires the disempowered to embed their actions in some control system that guides them to move from dependence to self-sufficiency. Although the control system may vary, the poor must engage in coordinated activities that are embedded in some organizational structure.” (p. 56)

That is, the essence of organizing for social change is often characterized by dueling tensions between the need to empower and emancipate individuals from the constraints of bureaucratic control, while simultaneously controlling them through that very emancipation. Norton (2009) argues that the formation of this tension happens diachronically through the constraints and strategies of organizing processes.

There are specific gaps in research related to the dialectical tensions of organizing as they relate to new media, geography, and counter-mapping. Most analyses of dialectical tensions look less at these tensions as they are embedded in organizational texts and more specifically at how individuals vocalize these tensions through interviews or ethnographic analysis, such as Ashcraft's (2005) elucidation of dialectical tensions and masculinity in airline pilots. Focusing on the texts, publications, and discourses produced by organizations, however, allows one to understand certain tensions as they are embedded in both their vision and are reified by the medium used to portray that vision. The closest example of this research is Papa et al.'s (2006) illustration of the dialectic of dialogue and dissemination as it underscores the tensions inherent to television. However, just which dialectical tensions are germane to the organizational discourse of counter-mapping texts on Google Earth is in need of examination. Furthermore, how those tensions are related to the creation of place as a locus of organizing activity and meaning is of further conceptual development. Thus, with that in mind, I pose the following research question:

RQ2: Which dialectical tensions are inherent in using counter-maps on Google Earth to direct the meanings of place for organizing collective action?

Ideally, this will not only offer theoretical insight into the dialectics of movement publications and strategy, but will also provide an examination of tensions that can be practically managed for place and Google Earth based organizing in the future.

CHAPTER THREE: ANALYZING COUNTER-MAPPING ORGANIZATIONAL DISCOURSES ON GOOGLE EARTH: CRITICAL FRAMEWORK AND TEXTS

My focus in this thesis is to take the counter-maps produced on Google Earth and treat them as organizational discourses -- texts that can give insight into an organization's transformation of space to place in order to organize for social change. This focus opens up the possibility of treating these texts as similar to movement publications, employee handbooks, or the plethora of other organizational texts produced for both constituents and potential adherents. In doing so, I treat the maps as artifacts representing the organization and its strategy. This also allows me to identify dialectical tensions that are evident in the organization's vision for the future. While this does not get to every tension faced by the organizations, it does lend insight into the types of tensions associated with their use of place and their use of Google Earth. In this chapter, I describe the two organizations, and which of their maps, I will analyze to understand how place can be used to mobilize collective action on Google Earth. Then I explain my analytical framework guiding the interpretation of these maps.

Cases and Texts Used for Analysis

I elect to focus on two organizations, Appalachian Voices (AV) and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), as they represent the spectrum of power, government affiliation, issue-orientation and global goals. While USHMM is an inherently global organization, with transnational goals, AV is mostly local and its affiliation with the global is entirely from below. Thus, using these two organizations allows me to contrast the use of place by two organizations with different goals, different

relationships to globalization, yet both using counter-maps and local place to motivate change. Truly, contrasting these two uses of local place should provide insight into various strategies and the resistant potential of constructing place.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

The first organization under analysis is the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. USHMM is a government entity concerned with counteracting violence and genocide throughout the world. The organization states that their mission is to “advance and disseminate knowledge about this unprecedented tragedy; to preserve the memory of those who suffered; and to encourage its visitors to reflect upon the moral and spiritual questions raised by...the Holocaust.” (United States Holocaust Museum, 2009). While the organization’s primary presence is developed through the physical memorial to the Holocaust situated in Washington D.C., the organization also facilitates programs for organizing action against current genocide threats throughout the globe. These initiatives include leadership programs, distribution of educational materials, and, among others, mapping initiatives on Google Earth.

The Maps of the USHMM. The United States Holocaust Museum has two different maps by which it supports its counter-mapping initiative. The first is the *World is Witness* map. This map is mostly designed to point to the narratives, photographs, and local experiences of genocide in Africa. When using the map to “direct” spatial travels on Google Earth, the individual follows various links marked with a shadowed symbol of a head against a blue backdrop with various titles such as “Goma on the Edge,” “Crises in the Kivus,” or “The Most Beautiful Hill in Rwanda.” Clicking on any of the links

presents the photographs and journals of traveler and photojournalist Michael Graham, chronicling a virtual experience of traveling through a genocide-ridden Rwanda. For my analysis, I will focus on all of the direct icons linked to place in order to read their place-framing, but will not focus on external links to websites, or discussion forums. The reasoning for this is that I am looking for what the user on Google Earth directly experiences as organizational discourse when actually in that virtual place.

The second map produced by the United States Holocaust Museum is the *Crisis in Darfur* application. This application is specifically geared towards stories, facts and statistics of destruction and genocide in Darfur. The symbols to follow through Darfur are bright and intense symbols of fire. Each fire symbol directs the user through a mapping of the virtual landscape associated with damaged and destroyed villages. The map informs the user that “Between 2003 and 2005, at least 200,000 civilians died from violence, disease and starvation, tens of thousands of women were raped and more than 2.5 million people were driven from their homes” (United States Holocaust Museum, 2009). Traveling through these maps allows users to experience various photographs, testimonials, and videos bearing witness to the genocide. I will focus on three sets of icons used to map the landscape in Darfur: the destroyed villages map, the brief captions, and the “historical imagery” portion of the map.

The USHMM map also entails an analysis of another map that is structurally connected to it at a number of places. That is, upon visiting a number of landscapes through the world is witness map, Google Earth auditors are asked to consider the maps of Women for Women International. WWI’s map is a set of photographs set in various

places across a number of continents and countries. Each of these photographs provides a caption detailing the local suffrage of women in various places around the world. The photographs that organize this map are taken by Susan Meisalas and the captions are drawn from a series of photographs and writings entitled “The Other Side of War: Women’s Stories of Hope and Survival.” This series was published in *National Geographic* in 2006. The Google Earth map takes this series and transplants it onto a global medium, directly placing the photographs and the auditor viewing them in the “local” place. However, as my central focus is on USHMM, I am only analyzing this map as it is offered as a continued networked place within USHMM’s map.

Appalachian Voices

The second organization under examination is entitled Appalachian Voices. AV represents the environmental movement and has a stake against global development as it depletes natural resources and promotes environmental destruction. AV is primarily a place-based movement as it attempts to influence global resource extraction from its view of the local. AV has strong inter-organizational connections to similar place-based collectivities such as Coal River Mountain Watch and Kentuckians for the Commonwealth. Together, AV and these organizations are primarily concerned with counteracting the process of mountaintop removal in Appalachia. This is the process by which mountains are blown apart with dynamite, and the overburden rock is dumped into neighboring valleys so as to have easier access to deep-seated coal deposits. AV attempts to use its organizational discourse to mobilize action against this environmentally and health-threatening process of resource extraction.

The Maps of Appalachian Voices. The movement against mountaintop removal has become one of the central users of counter-mapping on Google Earth. The creators of the Appalachian Voices' maps state that "the Appalachian mountaintop removal layer in Google Earth is a project of seven grassroots organizations in Appalachia working together to end the devastation of our mountains, homes and communities caused by mountaintop removal mining" (Appalachian Voices, 2009). A Google Earth user encounters a number of different maps produced by this organization (and its place-based affiliates) including the *National Memorial for the Mountains* and the *Most Endangered Mountains Video Series*. For my frame analysis, I only focus on the second of these maps as the videos offer the most explicit call to collective action to save the mountain landscape. This map includes an ideological place laced with verbal narrative captions as well as videos chronicling environmental and human destruction caused by irresponsible mining tactics. The icons are small, blue triangles designed with a bright, centered aiming symbol, positioning the landscape as the target for firearm activity. Most of the icons feature a story of an individual living in a community threatened by mountaintop removal. The videos expand upon these stories in more visually compelling and detailed ways. I analyze all of the videos used to map this landscape and the narrative captions that contextualize the videos.

Analytical Framework

To approach these maps as organizing discourses, I have elected to use the concept of place-framing as my analytical framework. Place-framing was developed by Martin (2003) as a framework that bridges the vocabulary and analytical tools of

“collective action framing” with the geographical insights of place-making. In combining these two scholarly traditions, looking at the maps through the lens of place-framing offers the potential to see how place is used to organize collective action. Meanwhile, it still maintains a focus on tools for elucidating visions for collective action and, as such, offers the possibility to address the dialectics of future-oriented organizational discourse. Thus, understanding the framework of place-framing requires first outlining the analytical vocabulary of collective action framing.

Collective Action Framing

Collective action framing was largely developed by Benford and Snow (1988, 2000). Working from Goffman (1974), Benford and Snow made the assertion that framing activities are central to the way social movements organize meanings to motivate collective action. Goffman (1974) suggested that frames are “schemata for interpretation, which are used by individuals to attach meaning to events and occurrences” (Sandberg, 2006, p. 211). Frames help us construct and interpret the often chaotic dimensions of the world. Collective action framing involves frames constructed not just for individuals but for collectivities working to counteract the dominant status quo, to “re-frame” the means by which the world is perceived and processed, and to provide an overall rationality for action. In this sense, Sandberg (2006) defines collective action frames as “action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate social movement activities and campaigns” (p. 211). Thus, the analysis of framing works from common assumptions in communication and rhetorical theory; namely, that reality is constructed through the language we use. As such, the symbols used by social movements may direct

interpretation, motivation and action for collections of organizations (Benford & Snow, 2000). Because of this focus, Benford and Snow (2000) view movement actors and organizations “as signifying agents actively engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning for constituents, antagonists, and bystanders or observers” (p. 613).

Analyzing Collective Action Frames

Benford and Snow (2000), among others (Gamsen et al., 1992), provide a three-part schema for scholars interested in understanding how organizations frame collective action. They state the three framing tasks a movement must accomplish, in order to outline the parameters of a given reality, are the diagnostic frame (detailing a problem in reality), a prognostic frame (symbolically outlining a solution to the problem), and motivational framing (symbolically creating frameworks for motivated collective action) (Snow and Benford, 1988). Thus, the diagnostic framing uses organizational texts and discourses to construct a problem to be countered by collective force. This may involve not only what the problem entails, but also who is responsible for the problem. Prognostic framing involves the rhetorical construction of the proposed solution to the problem. They detail what can be done and what the organization is already doing to rectify the problem. Finally, motivational framing involves the expression of motivation and agency, addressing a potential adherent’s question “why should I act?” (Benford & Snow, 2000; Sandberg, 2006). This not only tells an audience why they should act, it identifies or constitutes (Charland, 1987) the type of movement adherent that is capable of acting. In short, as Sandberg (2006) states, “Collective action frames should encompass a diagnosis and prognosis of a problem and a call to action for its resolution” (p. 211).

For many who have analyzed social movement or non-governmental organizations, these three terms provide an appropriate methodological framework for analyzing collective action (e.g. Diani, 1996; Noonan, 1995). Using the themes of diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing to analyze the discourse of organizations has allowed researchers to pinpoint the precise dimensions of movement visions and indicate where issues or contradictions may reside in the use of these visions by SMOs. Taylor (2000) for instance, has used these critical categories to understand the master frame that guides many environmental movements today – the environmental justice frame – which, through its diagnostic, prognostic and motivational features, has the ability to combine both environmental and human rights concerns. Furthermore, Gamson et al. (1992) argue that a feature of nearly all social movements is the “injustice” frame that diagnoses the problem as one of injustice to a certain group or groups of people and garners motivation from human empathy. Certainly, the framework of collective action framing has helped give insight into the symbolic construction of reality for organizing movements.

However, the vocabulary of collective action framing has also been vital to addressing meaning-making processes outside of SMOs. For instance, the analytical framework has been useful for understanding which scholarly topics are capable of gaining tractions in multiple disciplines (Frickel, 2004). Furthermore, Mills, Francis, and Bonner (2007) have studied Australian nursing organizations and illustrated the means by which organizations used different diagnostic and prognostic frames for addressing nursing problems, but most organizations highlighted the importance of advocating

mentoring as a motivation frame for improvement. Thus, the analytical framework of collective action framing can offer insight into not only the symbolic action of social movements, but a number of organizational activities as well.

The Place-Frame: Using Place for Collective Action

Specific to my purposes here, Martin (2003) has analyzed the organizing function of place from the vocabulary of collective action framing, offering it as a vocabulary for organizational place-making. Martin (2003) argues that “organizations discursively relate the conditions of place – the common experience of people in place – to their different agendas for collective action” (p. 731) and in doing so “they construct the local...as the appropriate sphere for collective action” (p. 731). The place-frame suggests that place may be created in ways that have particular diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational features in order to get the people from that place (as well as outsiders) to act in accordance with the tenants of collective action. Martin (2003) illustrates the place-framing of four neighborhood organizations in Minnesota.

Specifically, Martin (2003) claims each dimension of collective action framing is realized in precise ways regarding an organization’s use of place. First, Martin (2003) says that “motivation place-frames should refer to the daily life experiences residents are likely to have in the neighborhood in order to foster recognition of their location-based commonalities” (p. 736). Martin (2003) found there were a number of motivational frames that characterized the organizational discourse of these neighborhood associations including focusing on the relationships between people and place in the community as well as place and activism. Interestingly, many of these frames focused on aspects of the

neighborhood not related to its residents, including definitions of place from economic and physical characteristics as these related to the agendas of the associations. Thus, those components of place that are most salient to the organization's agenda may be highlighted in motivational frames in order to address common desire for action among residents within that geography as well as concerned outsiders. If that part of place which highlights poor economic landscapes (e.g., closed down factories, emptied store fronts, and so on) can gather common concerns for improvement of the community, and if it can tap into the residents' sense of place, it can be an appropriate image for motivational framing.

Furthermore, Martin (2003) says that diagnostic place-frames should address "what the neighborhood should be like if it had no problems" (p. 739) and can start to describe those elements that seemed "out of place" so as to constitute a problem in the geography. That is, certain features of the place can be rhetorically constructed in such a way as to provide the interpretation that the place needs improvement and deserves appropriate action. For instance, Martin (2003) provides the example of one neighborhood association who focused on "problems that directly referred to the neighborhood landscape [which] involved concerns about the need for public space to foster informal social interactions" (p. 740). Again, the diagnostic place frame is able to focus on those components of place that are seen as detrimental to the health of the urban neighborhood either in their presence or absence.

Finally, place can be constructed in such a way as to direct future action: the prognostic dimension of place. The prognostic features of a place-frame should focus on

the means by which future-oriented human action can work to restructure the place so as to alleviate the problem with the landscape addressed in the diagnostic frame. Martin (2003) argued all of the neighborhood organizations created the prognostic place frame as related to their improvement of the physical landscape. In illustrating how the physical space is being improved upon by their organizations, the neighborhood collectives hoped to illustrate the means by which they could re-place their landscape. Thus, working from a common identity regarding their place (motivational frame), and illustrating the problematic features of that place (diagnostic), they hoped to create place out of space in such a way as to gather support for their association's vision for improving the future landscape (prognostic). In constructing collective action, the landscape was the locus of communicative strategy.

Re-thinking the Place-Frame

Martin (2003) clearly illustrates the utility of place-framing for connecting concerns over the symbolic construction of geography with organizing activities. However, the place-frame is presented with new challenges during globalization. As stated earlier, globalization presents new concerns regarding the organization of space. As Routledge and Cumbers (2009) say, "places are not only internally plural, they are also connected to extensive economic, political and cultural networks with varying geographical reach" (p. 85). Thus, the meanings, identities, oppression, and empowerment associated with space are being redesigned during globalization not just on local terms, but through complex transnational geographical networks. As such, the place-frame during globalization may have the more difficult task of framing the

connections between these geographically disparate, but ideologically similar, places in order to collectively construct an idea of “place” that can confront the major ideologies of the global world. Thus, a place-frame addressing Google Earth, and the global platform it presents, needs to address the way those global counter-mapping organizations not only create the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational features of *one place* but how the maps attempt to focus attention on a number of places with similar framing discourses. This is especially true for analyzing counter-mapping as the point of maps is to network different places around common themes. Indeed, analyzing counter-mapping discourses on Google Earth offers the perfect chance to understand how the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational features of place span across different sites within the same map. Thus, my first method involves addressing the place-framing themes across different places on the same organization-produced maps. This will help me address RQ1: how do these globally-focused organizations, and their maps, use place as a strategy for collective action?

Place-Framing and Dialectics

In using the place-frame as my guiding critical framework, I am also going to allow the results of the analysis of different place-frames to bring forth dialectical tensions that characterize their organizing efforts. Thus, after analyzing the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational features of the place-frames, I will reevaluate the frames for specific tensions that may characterize their use of place for motivating collective action. In doing so, I will also discuss how the dialectics germane to their use of place for organizing collective action may be reinforced by the use of Google Earth technology as

an organizing tool. Doing this will allow me to answer RQ2: what tensions are associated with the way these organizations use place on Google Earth for collective action? Thus, the results section will begin with an analysis of the place-framing activities of a number of different organizations on the database and will conclude with the tensions inherent in those frames. While this surely will not elucidate all of the tensions in this case of organizing, it will provide a start, particularly as associated with the use of place on a global platform.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE NATURALIZED INJUSTICE AND DE-NATURALIZED COMMUNITY PLACE-FRAMES

In this chapter, I discuss the results of my place-frame analysis. I first discuss the *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum* maps (and their relationship to the *Women for Women International* maps). I argue that these maps frame place through what I call the “Naturalized Injustice Frame.” I organize my discussion of this frame and the maps that create it through the three main themes of the place-frame: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames. I then turn to what I argue is the central place-framing discourse of Appalachian Voices’ maps: the “Denaturalized Community” place-frame. I organize my discussion in terms of the traditional tenants of place-framing. By comparing and contrasting these two uses of place, I show two different ways by which place can be used to motivate action on Google Earth.

I then take these analyses and allow them to present some possible dialectical tensions regarding both using place and using Google Earth for organizing on a global database. I argue that there are two core tensions in the place-framing activities of both counter-mapping discourses on Google Earth: the representation of place from a subjective or objective perspective (subjectivity/objectivity dialectic) and the representation of people-in-place as victims or agents of change (victimization/agency dialectic). It may just be that Google Earth not only makes it impossible to escape these tensions, but using place for organizing for collective action on the medium may then perpetuate these tensions as both place-frames seem to contain various elements of them.

Naturalizing Injustice: The Maps of the USHMM

First, I will discuss the maps of the USHMM. I argue that these maps obtain their organizing meaning by taking the space of the virtual earth and naturalizing injustice into the landscape. In doing so, they create local place in such a way as to organize global outsiders to engage in the transformation of that place. I begin by explaining the diagnostic portion of this framing, focusing on specific instances in the World is Witness and Crisis in Darfur maps where natural space is associated with human injustice to evoke injustice-laden meanings of place. I also discuss how this relates to public memory on the Crisis in Darfur map wherein the only representation of place-memory is associated with narratives of victimization. Then I explain the prognostic portion of the place-frame associated broadly with global interference in place and narrowly the actions of courageous individuals. I follow this with a discussion of the motivational frame oriented around the subject position of witnessing. Finally, I conclude with an explanation of what this strategy of place-framing tells us about USHMM's overall use of place for organizing purposes.

Diagnostic Place-Framing

In the maps of both organizations, the central portion of creating place in response to the diagnostic portion of collective action framing is directly related to strategies for tying verbal and visual rhetoric into the landscape. The diagnostic frames are rhetorically created by way of fixing or naturalizing certain features of human life into the space to create place. Thus, as Martin (2003) has shown, the diagnostic frame points to the

features of the landscape that either do not, and need to, exist or are problems that need to be rectified. The specific framing strategies of these two organizations have a tendency to diagnose problems with place by suggesting that features of human life are naturally tied to the place. However, which features of human life USHMM (an inherently global organization) and Appalachian Voices (an inherently local organization) foreground in terms of connection to the landscape are much different. Whereas the USHMM essentially fixes violence and injustice into the landscape, Appalachian Voices fixes features of culture, community, and lifestyle into place.

Diagnosing Injustice on the World is Witness Map. On the World is Witness map, the USHMM tends to use a diagnostic place-frame that works by way of diagnosing the place as a local that naturally makes manifest the problems indigenous to it. Weaving through the places the map creates, I first focus on the icon entitled “Goma on the Edge,” located in the Democratic Republic of Congo, latitude: -1.68401/longitude: 29.2252. Working through the map, upon arrival at this icon, the subject perspective of the auditor is positioned far enough from the earth to view the presence of a Volcano on the virtual landscape relatively close to the icon. The spatial positioning is obviously intended to make the place itself a point of rhetorical invention for diagnostic framing in “Goma on the Edge.” The volcano is directly tied to the caption of the text of the map, stating “In 2002, the volcano Nyiragongo erupted and sent molten lava flowing through the airport, city center and into Lake Kivu. *The city was rebuilt on top of the hardened volcanic rock, and at times I could almost imagine we were driving on the moon*” (Graham, 2007, *emphasis added*). This quotation is used as a preface to the destruction and injustice

occurring in the area. After this quotation, the verbal caption enters into a discussion of the wars and battles that are occurring in the place. The barrenness of the volcano-influenced place in this discourse serves as a point of invention for the battles and destruction that occur there. The volcanic city presents no possibility for fertility, for life forms, and the very essence of the place is constructed in terms of its historical association with volcanic eruption. The barrenness, destruction, and so forth, tied to volcanic eruption underlie the very foundation of the city and provide a history for the construction of the place-based locality. Thus, the battle-torn context is directly tied to the volcanic landscape upon which the city was built; the problem is diagnosed in reference to the essence of the foundations of the locality. And that diagnostic problem foundational to the city is given more credibility as the “objectivist gaze” of Google Earth presents an image of that volcano just left of the icon.

Another example occurs two links after this space, woven with another place, at a link entitled “We Sleep on Stones.” The caption begins, “the sound of exploding shells mixes with afternoon thunder; only those who live or work here can tell the difference” (Graham, 2007). The essence of gunshots is rhetorically associated with the objective features of the place: thunder and climate. Interestingly, and this will be related to the motivational frame, this diagnosis suggests that you have to directly be able to perceive the place from those who subjectively know it in order to understand the difference between the gunshots and the essence of place. The difference between place and injustice must be understood from the local sense of place. From the global, however, this is not possible. From the perspective of the outsider, the position within which the auditor

is still positioned through the gaze of Google Earth, the battles over human rights (the gunshots) are intricately connected to the place, landscape and locality (thunder/weather/essence of space). The auditor is never asked to get too close to the subject position of the individual in the photograph – to understand place from their perspective. While this is somewhat of a possibility, the subjectivity is only ever experienced in reference to the experience of global objectivity. From that position, the local place is to be diagnosed with human rights battles as indistinguishable from the landscape.

There are few more networked places that construct this place-frame in the World is Witness that I will briefly indicate so as to illustrate the presence of this rhetorical construction of the “naturalizing injustice” diagnosis. On the mapping icon that is linked to Kibumba, Democratic Republic of Congo, latitude -1.511/longitude 29.33, the rhetoric again ties what exists naturally in the local place to the essence of war: “The most coveted tools of warfare in North Kivu are not grenades, or even shoulder missiles...children are the weapon of choice.” Meanwhile the icon “From a Thousand Hills” states “Rwanda is a land of a thousand hills, a tiny vividly beautiful country in central Africa, home to some of the world’s last remaining Mountain Gorillas. But it also will be forever known as the place where, in 1994, genocide consumed every hill and corner, bodies clogged the rivers, and the ‘international community’ turned away.” Here, with both of these texts, it has become a natural and essential feature of the local landscape, the local place, to tie notions of human rights injustices to the essence of the place. While the rivers in Rwanda are beautiful, they will forever be seen as rivers filled

with bodies. The injustices done to human rights have been inscribed and fixated in the landscape. The final example, and perhaps most powerful, is the visual and verbal rhetoric that is mapped into Nyamata, Rwanda. Here the mapping text is entitled “Day becomes Night.” Here we also explicitly see the rhetorical framing of place as problems naturalized into the local landscape. The text presents an image of what appears to be very peaceful stars against a black sky with a darkened statue of the Virgin Mary hanging forlornly on the brick walls. The lights on the wall seem to make a cross to the right of the screen. The caption reads:

For an instant, I saw the night sky – a thousand points of light on a dark canvas, the Milky Way, Orien’s Belt – but it was almost noon, and other details forced me back to reality: blood stains on the walls and bullet holes in the Virgin Mary; a smashed alter and an iron door twisted nearly off its hinges. My “stars” were thousands of tiny holes punched into the tin roof by grenade shrapnel.

Not only does this reinforce the association between crimes against humanity (bullet holes/murder) with the natural features of the space (stars) in order to construct a diagnostic vision of the local place as naturalizing injustices, fixing them into the landscape, it also may suggest that relationship is inherently a threat to the Virgin Mary and what we are later told is a “Catholic Church,” a “Sacred Place.” Human injustice is naturalized in the place to the extent that Western religion cannot survive there.

Thus, with the World is Witness map, one common theme that can be generated across the various spaces and geographies, is that space is turned into place in accordance

with a “naturalizing injustice” rhetorical framing of place. This is a rhetorical invention through place-making of the diagnostic place-frame, suggesting the problem to be countered by the organizations (human death, injustice, mass murder) is something that has become fixed and inscribed in the local. The rivers (natural space) will always be associated with dead bodies (making place through association with injustices). The stars and thunder (natural space) will always be associated with bullet holes and gunshots (making place through the rhetorical association with injustices). As such, the place-making across places that are networked, or woven together, can be read in light of a naturalizing diagnostic place frame wherein the problem to be encountered is directly inscribed in the local landscape.

Diagnosing the Crisis in Darfur. One question to be addressed is whether the organizational discourse manifested in the mapping initiatives performed by USHMM actually frames the place in such a way across their different maps so as to use a collective action vision of place as a common organizing resource for a number of different issues. In order to address this, I turn to the diagnosis place-frames regarding the Crisis in Darfur map as well. There is a strangeness that pervades the crisis in Darfur map due to its inherent simplicity. All that is present on this map are the bare minimum of place descriptions including stories without a strong visual accompaniment and visual photographs without an elongated verbal accompaniment. There seems to be this assumption on these maps that the picture or the story can “speak for itself.”

Thus, the map has a very simple aesthetic that suggests only the facts of the place need to be described and certainly this plays into the means by which “place” is

mobilized to present the problem (injustices to human rights) as essential to the geography. For instance, the captions that are mapped onto the landscape use nothing more than a short paragraph of words detailing local victimization or injustice and the virtual image of the earth, the “objective” virtual earth. If the point of maps is to, as Glass (1998) reminds us at the beginning of this thesis, reduce the chaos of the world and “focus obsessively on one thing,” then the “one thing” that guides the places mapped on the crisis in Darfur map is a simplified rhetoric of victimization as tied to place. Interestingly, the crisis in Darfur map never forces an individual to get too close to the landscape, allowing local place-constructing captions to be presented from a safe distance, a global gaze. Thus, the captions of victimization are only associated with a distant “objective” view of space.

Some strong examples of the brief captions of injustice which are viewed from a global distance include: “First the government soldiers came with the vehicles and started shelling the villages with rocket propelled grenades and heavy weapons and then the Jenjawid came and shot at everybody. More than 60 were killed from Bindisi on 16 August.” Another caption which describes the town of Kutum states “The Jenjawid came in the morning, broke the shops and took the money, the sugar, and the goods. They killed 32 people in their houses. They came in the houses to find the boys and men and kill them.” The only way the place is defined by these captions is through the rhetoric of victimization. Interestingly, the individual is positioned so far away from the landscape that the specific cities the captions attempt to describe injustice are indistinguishable from the rest of the African continent. Thus, there is no specificity associated with the place

from this distance other than the borders drawn around the African continent and captions of victimization and injustice. While this is certainly necessary, the reductionism of the map here, which is amplified by its aesthetic of simplicity, presents a simple association between place and victimization, and nothing else. Precisely, the map produced by USHMM naturalizes injustice into the place by denying the rights of the landscape to a complex history of complex human behavior or other complex place-making discourses. What is important, then, in terms of understanding the diagnosis of “naturalizing injustice” into the landscape is what is missing when the place is reduced to only one dimension of injustice.

Precisely, it is much of the temporality of memory that is missing. There is a memory associated with the place that only offers a vision into naturalized injustice. Parks (2009) provides a place to begin thinking about the memory of the place that is missing. For instance, in reference to the map of photographs detailing Darfur, she mentions that the dates of the images, of the photographs taken, are decidedly hidden from the viewer, which perpetuates the “Western imaginings of the African continent as perpetually in strife” (p. 540). Certainly this plays into the diagnosis of place as “naturalizing injustice” from the Westernized view. Just as the individual is positioned spatially to be unable to determine differences in localities on the African continent, so too is the temporality of the images constructed to refuse complex histories of place-making. The African continent, and all of its localities, is always a place of injustice. The problem is inescapable from the place and, as such, should be interpreted in light of naturalized injustice.

To be more precise, there is a colonial history that influences Darfur, which is denied vocalization in the reductionist discourse of the USHMM map. Parks (2009) says what is missing on the Crisis in Darfur map is information regarding the (post)colonial politics of the region and the history of the place outside of local injustice, ignoring peace-keeping efforts as well as the troubles and injustices done to those non-locals who attempt to reify peace keeping efforts. She states:

What is missing in the layer is a history of the (post)colonial geopolitics of the region, information about the various ceasefire treaties that have been signed and violated, details about aid workers and peacekeepers killed in the conflict, and information about the perpetrators of violence and their resources and maneuvers. (p. 537)

Parks informs the critique of the diagnosis frame of “naturalized injustice” by illustrating the exclusion of the memory of place which could cause it to be used in decidedly different (and decidedly anti-globalist) forms. In naturalizing injustice, however, this diagnostic frame refuses the logic of global colonialism. As Parks says:

It would also be important to include historical details about events such as the Berlin Conference of 1885, the “Scramble for Africa,” which divided up the continent among European powers, and had the effect of introducing animosities in the region derived from colonial policies and the biopolitical constitution of majorities and minorities” (p. 537).

Thus, the Crisis in Darfur map is decidedly mute in its discussion of the colonial histories of the place. For instance, the caption tied to Kutum described earlier makes no mention

of the inequalities of the distribution of goods and service, reinforced by global capitalism, that helps induce violence against humans over those goods and services.

Thus, part of the simplicity of the Crisis in Darfur map that has a tendency to possibly naturalize injustice is a reduction of the *public memory* of the place. The historical narratives that construct the Darfur regions are only ones of local violence and victimization, absent of global histories. It is as if the global has never influenced the region until now, until the present gaze offered by Google Earth. In other words, the public memory it presents is a memory of place without colonialism. As Said (2000) says, places present memories that are “not necessarily authentic, but useful” for certain groups and people (p. 180). In naturalizing injustice within the region, the diagnostic place-frame suggests injustice has always influenced the region, is natural to the region, ignoring the colonialist tendencies constructing that injustice, a colonialism reified in the globalism that is perpetuated by the surveillance of Google Earth. For instance, one mapping feature offered by the Crisis in Darfur application is the ability to map the space in light of historical visions of the landscape, directing one’s public memory. The memories, however, often only go back to 2004 and illustrate the place before the present injustice. The memory makes no mention of the long series of histories and colonial tendencies that have reinforced global inequalities, but instead merely focuses on the memory of the place as it is tied to current localized injustices. It is not that the image is not powerful – it certainly is – my argument is that the history that turns the space into place is only defined by a history, a memory, of local injustice and victimization, one that excludes any global issues from the public memory.

Thus, with its spatial and temporal reductionism, place is used on the Crisis in Darfur map to diagnose the problems in Darfur (the rhetoric of victimization) as the only way to interpret the landscape; it naturally informs the landscape and always has (the use of place as related to that diagnosis). In reducing the world to one item, the maps created by the USHMM, in association with Google Earth Outreach, attempt to use place to motivate action first by diagnosing the problem as naturally inherent to the local, only allowing a Google Earth user to interpret the place from the diagnosis associated with the place-frame. In both maps, this naturalized injustice is directly related to the construction of a public memory of place as only determined by local injustice, a vision of place for organizing collective action that excludes the global colonialist histories and problems of the region.

Here, then, we get to the first and the major potential problem with the naturalizing injustice diagnosis frame: it does not attend to the problems of place as related to globalization. In making injustice natural to the landscape, it fails to offer the place as an organized framework against globalization. It may be, in fact, that organizations which have an interest in the spread of globalization (United States government organizations such as the USHMM or Google Earth) can easier motivate action by diagnosing the local as naturally experiencing injustice. While the intentions are certainly noble, and we have to acknowledge that, we do also have to be aware that the implications of this particular diagnosis of place may lead to some problematic, Westernized and colonial implications for the rest of the collective action framing: the prognostic and motivational frames. Indeed, as Benford and Snow (2000) state, “the

identification of specific problems and causes tends to constrain the range of possible “reasonable” solutions and strategies advocated” in the prognostic frame (p. 616).

Prognostic Features of the Naturalizing Injustice Frame: Global Interference

Diagnosing the problem associated with collective action as inherently informed by the injustices natural to the locality creates a discursive opening for a particular kind of place-based prognostic response. As Martin (2003) illustrates, the prognostic portions of place-framing deal with those portions of the place that can be changed to make the place fit the goals of the organization and its collective vision. Particularly, it deals with tangible behaviors related to place that the organization is doing to promote positive change in the landscape, the place, the locality. Interestingly, if the place is constructed as a locality that is naturally experiencing the problems of human injustice, then an appropriate prognostic frame may be built around the place that promotes global interference. While this does not have to be the case, the diagnostic frame certainly presents the discursive opening for such a prognosis. I argue that this may be the prognostic frame that characterizes the “naturalized injustice” master frame for USHMM.

Prognosis on the World is Witness. I begin my analysis with the *World is Witness Map*. One thing that becomes immediately apparent is that the prognosis is illustrated in two ways by the organizational discourse of the USHMM: faith in the illumination of injustice and the courage of global citizens. That is, the USHMM suggests that the diagnosed problems of human injustice, diagnosed in the natural geography of place, can be counteracted both by simply shedding light on the ignored geographies of the

underdeveloped world and by philanthropic behaviors of global citizens of the developed world.

There are moments in the map wherein the importance of highlighting violence is mentioned. For instance, the icon located at the beginning of the map in Washington D.C., which is presented above an image of the city streets of D.C., with a surveillance image of the museum's building at the forefront. The icon explains the point of the map in the following way:

World is Witness enables citizens to bear witness to threats of genocide and related crimes against humanity, using the web and Google Earth. Through updates from at-risk areas, see for yourself what is happening on the ground, who is being targeted, and what courageous people are doing to respond.

This gets directly to the two prominent features of the prognostic frame associated with naturalizing injustice in place: the problems can be encountered by making global citizens bear witness to the events of destruction occurring around us and by courageous actions of those global citizens after having been positioned in the subject of witness. The important point about this prognostic frame, which is given meaning from the diagnostic frame, is that we start to see the use of local place not to organize local citizens, but to motivate collective action for people distant from the locality, while never challenging their global subject position. That is, the individual is never constituted as part of the locality, but is constituted as a "global citizen" as the prognosis of local place requires action from the resources of the global world. While organizations with transnational goals often motivate individuals beyond a locality to engage action, addressing how the

rhetical construction of local place influences this organizing action is of central importance to advancing research on global organizing for social change.

This prognostic frame is further developed in other icons throughout the map. On many of these icons, there seems to be an assumption that changes in the place, because they are natural to the space, are only going to come about by the efforts and actions of individuals not originally or naturally tied to the landscape. The prognosis cannot occur by using *place* to disrupt the user's affiliation with *global space*. Certainly, it is presumed that the youth of the Congo cannot do it as we have already seen they are utilized as part of the diagnosis of the naturalized problem. Furthermore, as we have seen, the *Crisis in Darfur* map only offers voice to the place through victimization, not solution. Thus, alteration to the place has to come from outside. This places an extra emphasis within the prognostic frames on the efforts of Western heroes. For example, one moment on the World is Witness map occurs at the sight of the icon entitled "Roadblocks." Here the caption shows the back of a young man walking and the caption reads:

With the help of a courageous American aid worker named Carl Wilkens (almost certainly the only American to stay during the entire genocide), Damas protected more than 400 children and Tutsi adults, hiding them above the ceiling and under beds. Known to the militia as a Hutu, he had no reason to risk his life to help strangers. For my friend Gasana's sake, deeply traumatized but alive, I am forever grateful he did.

Here, we are presented with a prognosis for a place-based solution: courageous action. However, Damas (originally from the place) cannot do it alone. Instead, he needs Carl

Wilkins (the American aid worker – not naturalized in place) to assist in the struggle. That is, there are people ready to engage in changes to the place in the location, but they need the help, the assistance, of the Western world, the Western Hero. Also, pointing out the reverse of this caption, the prognosis implies that part of the reason the place cannot emerge from its history of problems is because not enough Americans stayed in the place (we are told that Wilkins was the only one to stay). When there is not enough outside (Western?) influence on the African continent, genocide cannot be stopped. Most specifically, then, the place is denied a right to agency and, instead, created as a place which inherently benefits from openness to the outside, global world.

Another icon that seems to visually support this verbal anecdote of the courageous, philanthropic western hero, is located at Bukavu, Democratic Republic of Congo, latitude -2.5/longitude 28.88, and is titled “Crisis in the Kivus.” There is a decidedly bizarre picture that accompanies this icon. Unlike most of the visual photographs that seem to *diagnose* place, there is no picture of a suffering local. There is no focus on a saddened set of eyes, or a tired looking, frail body struggling through the local place. Instead, this picture seems to provide a *prognosis* for place, a potential for the future. The only image of what presumably are local citizens is placed in the background, around a small fire, out of focus. In focus, in the foreground, is the arm of white male with his sleeves rolled up, holding a pen in his right hand, seemingly ready to write. He has a camera strap around his neck, but you cannot see his face. The easiest way to interpret this image, it seems, is from the prognostic standpoint. It seems to suggest that outsiders, writing and photographing the injustice naturally occurring in the place, have

the ability to change the place, to “bring it into focus,” if you will. Beneath the picture, contextualizing this interpretation of the photography, are further links to the work of Western heroes, who have used their pens and cameras in the past to bring into focus the local place-based injustices. The Google Earth user is invited to “read traveling companion Michael Gerson’s column from his trip in the Washington Post” as well as “visit Angelina Jolie and John Pendergrast’s interactive journal on the Museum’s website to witness what they saw and heard during a 2004 trip to Eastern Congo.” The user is invited to experience (witness) the place from the perspective of the Western hero. This will be of further importance during the motivational frame, but for now suffice it to illustrate that at least a majority of the prognostic frame functions around the assumption of global interference from the western world.

Finally, the *World is Witness* map maintains a strong allegiance to the social movement efforts of *Women for Women International*. Their map is structurally linked with the map of this organization at many spots. The Women for Women International’s map becomes important to the efforts of USHMM’s place-framing because they seem to use the power of hyper-text to offer Women for Women International as an organization that can create prognostic influence on place. Traveling to the next spot on the map, again located at Bukavu, one is presented with an icon entitled “Women of War in South Kivu.” The icon simply tells the story of the *Women for Women International* Organization and its prognostic potential to the diagnosed problems of the local place:

After Breakfast, Jerry, Sarah, Mike and I spent the morning with Women for Women International, an organization that supports female survivors of war

around the world, from Iraq to here in eastern Congo. WWI supports more than 5,000 women in North and South Kivu, matching each woman with a sponsor abroad who provides \$27 a month, and exchanges letters.

Last year, I helped my sister Rachel set up a sponsorship for a woman in Congo. At the time, and in up until today, I gave little thought to the fact beyond noticing that each month it was withdrawn from my bank account. After all, I thought, it's less than a dollar a day – how much can this and a few letters a year really do to improve a woman's life?

We were introduced to a group of women who had just been handed translated letters from their sisters abroad. The moment they had them in their hands, their guarded expressions turned to smile, and they began to sing and dance – many of these women have suffered from intense brutality, and to see them happy from such a small gesture brought tears to our eyes.

Hundreds of women walked here this week from miles away to see if they can join the program. Most were turned away – a new member can be added only when someone who learns about their situation decides on behalf of a sister, daughter or mother to become a sponsor” (Graham, 2007).

It is not that what the USHMM and their organizational partnership with Women for Women International are not good and well-intended. What becomes the fear, however, is that when these organizations use a global surveillance medium to create place in such a way as to suggest it experiences natural injustices, the appropriate prognosis seems to be that the place benefits from its openness to the ultimate good will of the Western

world. Agency is taken out of the hands of the local and placed in the hands of the global world. The penny change of the western world can change the facial features of a woman from the Congo from “a guarded expression” to a “smile” and cause her to “sing and dance.” Meanwhile, this caption illustrates the inability, the lack of agency, for local citizens, who reside in place, to effect change through the program as “a new member can be added only when someone who learns about their situation decides on behalf of a sister, daughter or mother to become a sponsor.” While the efforts of these western women are certainly good, we must be careful when the organizational maps, with their exceptional reductionist abilities, reduce this to the only prognostic solution associated with fixing the place-based injustice.

Because this icon offers a link to the map created by Women for Women International, and because this seems to be the most prominent prognostic moment on the World is Witness map, I briefly attend to the map of this organization. Certainly, this map is almost entirely focused on prognostic features of the place-frame. It provides up-close pictures of women who serve as representative anecdotes of the success stories in both the regions of the Congo and the country of Afghanistan, accompanied by captions detailing their success associated with the global flow of good will and transnational capitalism. For instance, the first image is of Habiba in Kabul, Afghanistan and is accompanied by the following caption:

Habiba at the compound where she lives with her two daughters in a single room. “There were times in the midst of our walking that someone would yell, ‘The Taliban are coming!’ and we would all run fast, as we were afraid

for our lives.” Now, Habiba has completed the Women for Women International program and manages the women’s garden store in Kabul, a park and market area for women-run stores. Today she spends her days running the store, keeping the books and proudly chatting with customers.

Oddly enough, though the intention is certainly good, this verbal and visual rhetoric plays into the myth of Western interference: there is a hero (global capitalism) and a common enemy (the Taliban) and the hero has the power to alter the place to the point that the enemy can no longer nestle in the place. As long as capitalism becomes prominent in the area, putting women to work, there will be no more Taliban. Habiba can chat with the customers freely. In this anecdote, there is no sign of the Taliban in the place. It has been vanquished. Through global interference, the place has found a global solution to the local injustices. Place is created in this prognostic frame to outline the benefits of openness to transnational influence (global flows of capital can erase the Taliban from the local landscape).

Prognostic Frames in the Crisis in Darfur. The *Crisis in Darfur* map does present the possibility of reading the prognostic frame in similar ways across organizational texts. However, it is done through very minimalist means. For instance, turning to the map that has the various photographs, it becomes clear that the best way to imagine “illuminating” the landscape is from the perspective of the western hero. Parks (2009) points out that most of the photographs do not have a date attached to them so as to hide the temporal narrative of the photographs. The absence of dated photos plays into a public memory of Darfur as only defined by local victimization, a memory absent of complex global and

local place-making histories. With the photographs, as they relate to prognostic framing, it is again a matter of what is included and excluded that presents the strange prognosis for solution: local and global identities.

On the photographs, there is almost no sign of solution-based place-framing. It narrows the place to one dimension: injustice. As such, it offers very little potential for framing except, similar to the World is Witness map, through the western “illumination” of the region. The photographs offer close-up images of African tragedy, with slight captions that read similar to “In the tiny medical facility in Goz Beide, three men lay side by side, their eyes gouged out by the Jenjaweed knives.” Another icon shows an image of two women, whose faces can barely be seen, with a caption that reads “Women are interviewed by physicians for Human Rights Investigators. These women told stories of the destruction of their livelihoods and exposure to rape as their villages were being attacked.” Almost all of the photographs only identify the individual as “SLA Rebel,” or “A Woman,” or “A Family,” and their story of victimization. All of these examples do the same thing: provide an image of African tragedy without description of time or person, only a vague inscription of the nameless victim into the timeless place.

However, there is one indication of individuality. The only mention of individuality beyond African victim is associated with the credit for the picture. That is, while there is no identification of the “victim” in the picture, there is credit to what the World is Witness map would call the “courageous individual” who took the picture. That is, as I mentioned earlier, the USHMM places a great deal of importance on the efforts of individuals around the world as a way to organize global interference with place.

However, if the victims in the photographs are not able to be identified as individuals, they cannot fulfill the prognosis role of the courageous *individual* shedding light on the injustices naturally occurring in place. Instead, the only one who can is the western outsider. For instance, we are told that the first example was a photograph taken by actress “Mia Farrow” and the second was taken by the famous “Michael Wadleigh.” Thus, if the prognostic feature of the naturalizing injustice frame is focused on simply elucidating the injustice that occurs in the place and taking the role of the courageous individual, the way this is offered in association with the photographs is through the explicit indication of the, often times celebrity, individual who took it.¹

Thus, in both of the maps of the United States Holocaust Museum, it seems that the place-frame can read as follows: Invasions of human rights and injustices naturally occur in certain localities and geographies throughout the world (diagnostic). Because of this, place needs to be illuminated and altered and, to do so, requires global interference from beyond the local place and, particularly, from the philanthropic behaviors of the Western world (prognostic). Finally, the only portion of the place-frame yet to be explained in association with the USHMM and the naturalized injustice frame is oriented around motivation: How does the organization attempt to map place so as to motivate the individual on Google Earth to act?

Motivational Features of the Naturalized Injustice Frame: Witnessing

If the goal of the diagnosis and prognosis frame is to both naturalize injustice and show that the solution must be managed through the alteration of place by the courageous actions of westerners, the means by which motivation could potentially occur is by

allowing them to imagine the role associated with the position of what USHMM calls “the witness.” Collective action can be potentially motivated by doing as Martin (2003) says and allowing the motivational frame to “define the community that acts collectively, describing the group of actors and potential actors and exhorting people to act” (p. 736). Thus, because motivational frames gain their power not only for giving reasons to act, but also in constituting individuals within a subject position prone to action, the ways in which an individual is allowed to experience or inhabit the place on Google Earth can be an important geography-based rhetoric of motivation. Along with the constitution of actors, Benford and Snow (2000) also argue that these frames inherently contain a “vocabulary for action” that provide “adherents with compelling accounts for engaging in collective action and for sustaining their participation” (p. 617). Thus, motivation is gathered oftentimes in collective action frames by way of describing the actor and providing a vocabulary that necessitates action from that actor.

Much of the motivational frame was, if not alluded to, roughly outlined in the last section. Just as the prognosis (global interference) emerged from the diagnosis (naturalized injustice), so too does the type of audience member motivated to act and the vocabulary of action emerge from the prognosis. In other words, global alteration of place through the flow of capital, writing letters, or taking photographs and writing about place, necessitates a certain kind of individual to perform the action. That individual in this case is not someone necessarily with a sense of place regarding the locality, but one who is always connected to global resources and willing to utilize those resources for empathetic pursuits; what the “From a Thousand Hills” icon entitles a citizen of “the

international community.” Specifically, this community is made up of *witnesses*: a group of people who have seen and are empathetic towards the naturalized injustice, but aware of global resources and responsibilities and are celebrated for using those resources for global good. They are not a member of the local place.

A good way to describe the witness subject position might be a variation of what Slade (2007) termed the *survivor ethos*. For Slade (2007), the survivor ethos is “one who is living who should be dead and hence given testimony, however partial it may be, to the events of death that passed them by” (p. 86). The survivor, thus, is a rhetorically constructed position detailing one who has seen the death and is now able to testify to its existence and, as such, has a responsibility to testify. In creating the witness, it is a similar responsibility as the survivor. The witness has seen death and injustice (thanks to Google Earth or Mia Farrow), and is able to testify to that injustice and, in fact, has a responsibility to testify. This is reinforced on the map when the World is Witness icons not only use the word “witness” time and time again, but also when icons such as “From a Thousand Hills” state that, with past genocides, “the ‘international community’ turned away.” Turning away implies having first seen the destruction and then having done nothing. In essence, citizens of the global world witnessing the death and destruction denied their responsibility and agency for action. The witness subject position, after having seen, is now in a position to act. However, unlike the survivor’s ethos, a position of greater testimony, the witness does not imply having lived through the destruction in the local place. The witness is still an outsider. Hence, this is the relevance of the entire “naturalized injustice” frame wherein the prognosis and motivation, the action, needs to

come from global outsiders, not ones who are from the place. We need witnesses, not survivors.

The framing of the witness can be broken down into two dimensions: having seen the destruction or injustice (local empathy) and having been bestowed with a responsibility to act on behalf of that empathetic experience in accordance with global resources (global responsibility). Thus, the motivational framing is a matter of reinforcing empathy (while not constituting the witness as part of the local place), as well as reinforcing an awareness of the responsibility derived from global, developed resources. This is accomplished a number of ways on the maps of the USHMM.

First Dimension of Witnessing: Global Responsibility. Whereas motive to act in a place-frame could reasonably come from the extension of a local sense of place to both insiders and outsiders of the movement (Martin, 2004), this is not the case with the USHMM. The organization never extends local place to the Google Earth user as a way to constitute the individual as a place inhabitant. Truly, this may be nearly impossible on these maps as they reduce the complexity of the places, including culture and traditions, to narratives of victimization. This reduction eliminates the sources of a sense of place. Instead, in order to motivate action, the maps are careful not to constitute an auditor as a part of the local that naturally experiences injustice.

The first goal of constructing the witness is to position them continuously as outsiders to place and, more specifically, as the benevolent global visitor. This is done throughout. The World is Witness, for instance, maps the place of Rwanda and the Congo, among other local places, from the perspective and travels of outsider Michael

Graham. The *Crisis in Darfur* offers photographs mapped onto the landscape that offers an experience of place from the perspective of Mia Farrow and Michael Wadleigh. The lens from which the place is viewed is a powerful, western lens that glorifies global behavior. The Women for Women International Map similarly draws much of its resources from the Western perspective. There are a number of specific photographs on its map that explicitly construct the individual from the subject associated with a protected, safe, outsider gaze. For instance, one mapping icon positions the viewer of the photograph (and, thus, the place viewed) behind a car windshield, contextualized by the caption “A road leads through the eastern commercial hub of the city, as seen through the windshield of a vehicle operated by a non-government organization.” Thus, on this icon, just as the viewer of place is positioned in reference to Michael Graham’s travel journeys through place, or the photographic lens of Mia Farrow, this photograph also constructs the viewer from the perspective of outsider NGOs in the region. These are all still moments of the “identifying actors” in relationship to place as the global outsider. In fact, the global gaze of Google Earth is inherently the perspective of an outsider, positioning the relationship between the individual user and place as mediated by a multitude of vast technological networks and access to technology.

This global gaze, mediated by Google Earth, constructs the first part of the motivational framing of witnessing: awareness of global resources. That is, being an outsider is a position that bears with it an awareness of the resources of the developed world. Constituting the individual in relationship to the travel journals of Michael Graham or the perspective of Mia Farrow, or the courageous worker who stayed in

Rwanda and the view from the NGO's windshield: all of these construct a relationship to place that provides the user with an awareness of global resources and an ability to imagine the use of those resources in glorified terms. Most importantly, this positioning of place does not undermine the perspective offered by Google Earth -- a perspective mediated by the vast technological networks, the class-based access to technology that pervades the medium. Instead, it attempts to reinforce that Google Earth-inspired position by asking one to experience the place from the outsider's perspective. The place of injustice needs an outside influence and the Google Earth user can be the outside hero to alter that locality.

Second Dimension of Witnessing: Empathy for the Victim. Furthermore, in order for the outsider hero to be motivated to action, the USHMM attempts to provide a last reason for heroic action: the unforgettable nature of the victim's eyes. That is, the global witness, who has the resources and courage to interfere in a suffering local, just needs one more item to be constituted as witness: a personal encounter with the victim that has left the witness with an unforgettable memory. The *Crisis in Darfur* map may be incapable of this as the victims are never explicitly identified and often are simply vague encounters with injustice. The *World is Witness*, however, does attempt to provide a final motivation to mobilize global resources for the local place: a focus on the "eyes" of human victims. Focusing on the eyes reinforces a sense of empathy on the part of the viewer, but only as related to the victimization of place of which the eyes are evidence and which the viewer is never positioned as part of.

There are a number of examples of this. For instance, when traveling on the World is Witness map, clicking on one of the icons entitled “Afraid to Sleep in Walungu,” does not alter the global, Google Earth supplied vision of the user. But it does force on that user an image of a young female whose eyes are directly facing the auditor viewing Google Earth. Here, what was otherwise invisible in the objective view of the landscape has made itself manifest. The young female looks saddened, tired and frustrated. The verbal rhetoric reinforces this image by focusing on her eyes. The statement below the picture reads:

There is an unprecedented campaign to destroy women in Eastern Congo. Its cruelty is evident in the frightened eyes, stories and bullet scars of the women here in Walungu...After their violation many women such as Lucienne are left behind by their husbands, and shunned by their villages. Others say their husbands can no longer look them in the eyes, so ashamed and guilty they are of being powerless to protect their loved ones from the FLDR or other soldiers (Graham, 2007).

The focus on the eyes for mobilizing global responsibility becomes the primary means by which a local empathy is presented to the user throughout the map. Another example occurs at the icon “Horror and Hope at Panzi Hospital,” which provides a caption that reads:

Doctor Denis Mukwege repairs damaged women, helping each find a little dignity where they had only shame. The doctor is quick to smile; his tired eyes shine with kindness, but also with anger at the unspeakable things done

to the mothers and daughters of his community, tens of thousands of them, by men without a conscious.

And the list of specific icons focusing on the eyes continues on, such as the caption beneath “From a Thousand Hills,” which states:

I don’t remember exactly how we met three years ago in Kigali, but I do have a perfect recollection of Gasana’s eyes: troubled, constantly looking back and forth for signs of danger, full of kindness. And I remember the scars just above his forehead, a physical reflection of even deeper scars inside.

Thus, overall, the two main motivating dimensions of the USHMM are an awareness of global resources and the courageous actions of other western heroes, and direct contact with the eyes of African victims. In other words, the vocabulary entails a position of capable action and a need and place for focusing that capable agency. This vocabulary of action, and the subject position created by these maps in order to exhort action, not surprisingly, is perfectly characterized by the term “witness.” It is also very commensurate with the essence of Google Earth as a medium that offers an auditor an awareness of global resources and an elucidation of empathy in place.

The Overall use of Place by USHMM

Overall, the naturalized injustice frame that is mobilized by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum can be read in the following way: (1) Diagnostic Place-Framing: the problem is human injustice and it is naturally occurring in certain localities throughout the world, particularly in Africa. In Africa, space is transformed to place by way of injustice naturalized into the landscape. (2) Prognostic Place-Framing: If a place

is experiencing naturalized injustice, the solution needs to come by way of global outsiders and their resources, such as capital, or writing letters, or participating in transnational NGOs such as Women for Women International. Most importantly, the solution to place is not going to come from inside, as injustice is natural to the landscape, but from courageous action of the global world. (3) Motivational Place-Framing: The auditor of the map should do this because she or he is a part of the “international community” and the international community is a collection of witnesses. While they may have not survived the local event, they have witnessed it from the outside and from this position, with its resources, comes a responsibility for global action upon the local place.

In illustrating the use of this frame for USHMM on both their World is Witness and Crisis in Darfur maps, I have shown one use of place on Google Earth for motivating action. Based on the discussion of the diagnostic, prognostic and motivational features of this place-frame, I argue that the United States Holocaust Museum’s discourses and maps can be stated this way: The United States Holocaust Museum uses its creation of local place to organize collective action on Google Earth not for any local, oppressed individuals, but for a global citizen. In other words, oppressed places are mapped not to promote organized action on the part of oppressed individuals as would be the case with a true globalization from below movement, but instead on the part of those who exist in spaces of global power. Place is not used to motivate action based off of a common *sense of place* as is the case with Martin’s (2003) analysis of the Minnesota neighborhood associations. Instead, local places of Africa are used to motivate the behaviors (and

finances) of non-oppressed users of Google Earth. In order to motivate such action, they use place for that collective action by framing it solely around the theme of “naturalized injustice.” In only creating place in such a way as to suggest the locality only experiences injustices and crimes against human rights, place is used to motivate global citizens to provide courageous interference into the landscape.

Denaturalizing Community: The Maps of *Appalachian Voices*

I now turn to an analysis of the counter-mapping strategies of Appalachian Voices. In the following section, I again organize my discussion around the three elements of the place-frame: diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing. I begin by arguing that the diagnostic place-frame of these maps embeds community, culture and goodwill into the landscape. Certain places that pose threats to that community are then marked as diagnosed issues in the landscape. I follow this with an argument about the prognostic place-frame. Appalachian Voices presents a strategy for organized preservation of the local. While the USHMM was concerned with global interference, AV is concerned with stopping alterations of the landscape. They promote this by focusing on different places that embody prognostic themes of renewable energy, economic tourism, national public memory, and more. I then focus on the motivational place-framing of the *Most Endangered Mountains Video Series* map. This, I argue, is interesting because it is oriented around two audiences for motivation: one of place-inhabitants and one of outsiders. After explaining these two strategies associated with the motivational place-frame, I turn to an explanation of the overall use of place by AV.

Diagnostic Place-Framing

Like with the World is Witness map, the Appalachian Voices map also constructs the diagnostic frame by way of this theme associated with naturalizing issues into the environment. However, its diagnostic frame is more oriented towards “de-naturalizing community and culture” by way of damage to the parts of place that define those traditions and histories. Instead of only performing a diagnosis of the entire place as spatially and temporally defined by injustice and threats to human rights, it uses a more precise and subjective creation of place that pinpoints parts of the place and landscape that are associated with the local culture and community and are threatened by mountaintop removal mining. Thus, whereas the USHMM tends to diagnose the problem in terms of naturalizing injustice, the problem itself, into place, Appalachian Voices tends to naturalize into place those issues that positively define the sense of community and it diagnoses the problem by focusing on the threats to that naturalized community and culture. The result of these different place-framing processes is tantamount to advocating solutions based upon the preservation as opposed to alteration of the local place.

Reading the Appalachian Voices’ *Most Endangered Mountains Video Series* involves reading a number of different videos (and corresponding narrative captions) as they are placed into different sites in Appalachia, marked in place by a small aiming symbol. The application serves as a way of mapping the mountainous landscape in light of mountains that either have been blown apart for coal, or are potentially threatened by the prospect of mountaintop removal in the future. The map then uses the videos to not only direct the user’s attention to those spaces, but provides an in-depth account of the

place-making discourses of local citizens. Unlike the USHMM map, it is decidedly the voice of local citizens which defines the overall voice of the map for Appalachian Voices.

Understanding the diagnostic frame involves first, then, diagnosing those parts of the landscape that are “under fire” as the map’s symbol would suggest. The aiming symbols direct attention to those places in the landscape that are threatened by alteration. Thus, clicking on any given icon helps one understand the problem associated with altering place (which is hardly ever just the aesthetics of the mountain range, or environmental qualities). One icon, for instance, located at Huckleberry Ridge, Kentucky (there is no longitude and latitude stated on this map like there is on the USHMM maps) provides the following statement which directly expresses why the place is under attack and fire and why this is a place-based problem. After beginning with a quotation that reads “we are going to be the endangered species,” the caption continues:

Daymon Morgan’s woods are teeming with bloodroot, as well as golden seal, ginseng and wild ginger. Not too long ago, these native plants grew wild and plentiful not just in Morgan’s woods but in the neighboring mountaintops adjoining his property, on the tree-laden slopes that have been part of the majesty of the Appalachian landscape – and integral to the lives of his community –for generations.

But now, the mountaintops surrounding Morgan’s land are bleeding. More precisely, they are being blown apart with explosives. Mining companies are blasting off the tops of the mountains, pursuing a technique

that makes it easier and faster and cheaper to remove coal from the earth that holds it. It's an efficient technique: Explode the mountain; remove the coal; shove the waste over the nearest hillside; 'reclaim' the site; move on to the next site.

Morgan's fear isn't just for the streams, or the trees, the deer or the wild turkeys, the ginseng or the bloodroot. It's for his family and friends; their health and safety. And he fears for the welfare of all of us who, let's face it, live downstream."

The example is exceptional in part because it directly gets at using place for all three features of the place-frame, but for now I am just going to focus on the diagnostic problem. The example helps us realize that place is used to "naturalize" human life and culture. That is, the "tree-laden slopes" of the Appalachian Mountains are created as a place that is "integral to the lives of his community for generations." Indeed, place is created as a landscape where "family and friends...health and safety....and community" are all naturalized. The diagnosed problem of the destruction of landscape caused from mountaintop removal mining amounts to not just losing the mountaintops, but losing the community, cultural and family-based features naturalized within those mountains. The risk is a de-naturalization of community.

The theme of de-naturalized community is reinforced throughout the map as well at different sites and different places. The naturalness of the geography and of the place is consistently reinforced as nurturing and providing the essence of the community, culture, and positive social relations of the area. In naturalizing culture and people into place,

these counter-maps create a diagnostic place-frame that outlines and details threats that can potentially “de-naturalize community” by altering the natural geographical space. For instance, at “Wise County, VA,” the individual is positioned just left on Google Earth of what is obviously a mountaintop removal site as one can see dirt roads and sharp brown edges cut through the otherwise, green and rolling hills of the virtual earth (nearly all of the videos are positioned next to the view of a mountaintop removal site on Google Earth). The video then highlights the placement of community and culture into the landscape and defines what can be seen from the global (a mountaintop removal site) as the specific diagnostic problem:²

Despite the large scale extraction of natural resources (both coal and timber), county residents still have many things to be proud of. Wise County boasts some of the most beautiful mountaintop vistas in Appalachia. It’s home to Jefferson National Forest, which protects High Knob and little Stoney Creek Falls...Wise County also has a lively art community, with regular performances of the Trail of the Lonesome Pine Drama and shows at the Charles Harris Art Gallery. Arts and river festivals attract people throughout the summer to celebrate the county’s rich history and landscape....but mountaintop removal is destroying the land, the people, and our cultural heritage

Thus, while the Google Earth image is used to provide tangible evidence of the landscape, there is still a discussion of the things to be proud about regarding place. Once again, it is invasion of this injustice, which is not natural to place, that is the

problem needing to be rectified. While place is used to naturalize community, the threats of denaturalizing community in place becomes the central resource for diagnosing the threat to place. Thus, while there is a problem with place diagnosed, there is still a place used to motivate (local) action; there is still a reason to act. Even though “mountaintop removal is threatening cultural heritage,” the residents still live in a landscape defined by deeply-rooted cultural heritage.

Thus, in the Appalachian Voices’ use of place to diagnose a problem for collective action, there is no indication that injustice and human rights destruction naturally define or create the local place (specifically, the environmental and human injustices created by mountaintop removal do not naturally define the place). Instead, it is community that is natural and environmental injustice that is an invasive species. It is even more telling that the videos use their relationship with coal companies, which are often the economic and social foundations of the place, to promote place-based themes of community and goodwill as opposed to injustice. For instance, on the video that is placed at Benham and Lynch, Kentucky, the narrator states that these cities were actually created by the coal companies, but that this does not claim that the community naturally experiences injustice: “We’re somewhat of a unique community right here in Benham and Lynch because Benham was established by the International Harvester Coal Company and Lynch was established by U.S. Steel Coal Corporation.” However, this is not then associated with the injustice to place. In fact, the coal companies are seen as the source of the community, culture and place. They state “[the companies] mined the coal responsibly...they didn’t mine around the water supply...and, as a matter of fact, as they

were mining, they helped build these water supplies.” Thus, the memories of coal company relationships are used to create a view of place centered not upon naturalized injustice, but general goodwill. The natural features of place (the water supplies) are associated with the former goodwill, and the deep cultural heritage, of coal mining in the region.

This can be contrasted with the “Goma on the Edge” icon that used the volcano to create the foundations of place that referenced “the moon” or another barren landscape. The public memory of coal companies and their creation of these cities, however, are defined by a benevolent presence. Thus, specifically it is not the presence of the coal companies in the place that presents the overall problem associated with the place, but instead it is the loss of the mountains, the alteration of place, that presents the problem. The coal companies can exist finely in the landscape, but when their actions alter the place to the degree that all of those things naturally embedded in the landscape – culture, community, family, lifestyle, which the coal companies helped construct – this is the action that deserves diagnosis.

One final theme revolves around family history in the landscape. Just as culture and community are naturalized into the landscape, family is also used to define the natural space. As such, the destruction of the space amounts to threats to family heritage. On the icon located at “Coal River Valley, WV,” for instance, the caption beneath the video reads:

Lorelei Scarbro’s house in the little community of Rock Creek, West Virginia is the same house her husband built with his own two hands when they were

married, on land handed down to him from his parents. They raised their children in this house...Lorelei says her granddaughter takes particular delight in the wild turkeys that frequent the neighborhood. Now Coal River Mountain is slated for a mountaintop removal coal mine. If the coal company's plans go through, nearly 10 square miles of the mountain will be destroyed, and 18 valley fills will devastate the Coal River watershed.

It is not just the natural aesthetic beauty of the place that is cause for diagnosing problems with altering place through mountaintop removal, but instead it is the fact that family life is so rooted in the place that is cause for action.

This is what Tuan (1976) originally claimed was the fundamental means by which space is transformed to place: through the association of family narratives to the physical landscape. Another example occurs at Wise County, Virginia. Clicking on this icon draws the user of Google Earth to a close up virtual image of green hills ravished with the brown, flattened landscape of mountaintop removal sites. Around a minute into the video, the narrator, Kathy Selvage, states "My father took a job over here in Wise County working in a coal mine. He worked in the deep mines for approximately 30 years...when I was a little girl growing up, the home I lived in has actually been long since, uh, that terrain has been changed and it's in this vicinity." After this discussion of the loss of family landscape, the narrator discusses the negative ramifications of mountaintop removal. This is then followed with an image of Selvage on the front porch of her white home with an American flag flying the yard. Afterwards, private family life of the landscape is then again discussed as Selvage states "One of the things I would say that is

worth protecting is my Mother's right to have her daily Bible reading out on her front porch...without being interrupted...by the sounds of blasting and the sight of blasting."

At this space on Google Earth, the diagnosis of a problem (changes through the landscape brought by mountaintop removal) is bookended by discussions of family narratives embedded into the landscape. These narratives of the family evoke themes of employment, faith and patriotism threatened by the alterations to the space.

Prognostic Place-Framing

Unlike with the naturalized injustice place-framing of the USHMM, the place-framing performed by Appalachian Voices seems primarily to promote not global interference, but local maintenance of place. That is, whereas diagnosing place as naturally tied to injustice opens up the framing possibilities for altering place, the framing of denaturalizing community opens up the possibility of framing the prognosis related to maintaining place and, thus, maintaining community. This makes the prognosis occur "from below" – from within the place. It is telling that after each video, AV directs the Google Earth auditor to a specific *place-based* organization that can be contacted for assistance. At Coal River Mountain, West Virginia, the Google Earth auditor is directed to the *Coal River Wind Project* to assist in the movement. At the end of the Wise County, Virginia video, the inhabitant of the virtual earth is invited to contact *The Southern Appalachian Mountain Stewards*. At the conclusion of the video mapped at Huckleberry Ridge, Kentucky, the user is invited to support the local place by contacting *Kentuckians for the Commonwealth*. With each of these cases, it is clear that the map networks local place to geographically combine a number of different organizations within one

movement place-frame. The map, then, provides the organizing locus from a true experience with the local place.

In addition to networking places that evoke different organizations, Appalachian Voices also frames the prognostic of place by networking precise sites in the landscape that can be saved to slowly re-gain culture and heritage. The battle over the encroachment of free-market energy extraction (mountaintop removal) is a mountain-by-mountain battle. The specific mountains that are chosen as places for prognostic change are landscapes tied to the AV's multiple advocated solutions for the future. Reading the place-making surrounding the chosen mountains, it seems the landscape contains four prognostic themes: tourist economy, renewable energy, community history, and national memory.

First, there are a number of icons and places that represent a prognosis in terms of maintaining culture by preserving the economic landscape of tourism. Tourism is viewed as a reasonable economic prospect for the future and the map presents certain mountains as representative of that future (which is, of course, threatened by mountaintop removal). For instance, at "Gauley Mountain, WV," the video presents an individual who states:

About 1950 the coal company that was here, that made us a bustling community, pulled out...and in the last 8 to 10 years...we're making the town look better...we have a sense of pride in the community, everyone is starting to pull together, we have visions for it tied to an economy of tourism...if this mountaintop removal is allowed to go forth, than the wife and I have rental cabins called mountain memories, and there will be no

memories here because there will be no mountains....If there's any folks out there who'd like to help us, we'd love to have you...come to Ansted, WV.

Here, we have a clear prognosis of place developed around the themes of economic tourism. They have “a vision of [place] tied to an economy of tourism.” Those places, such as Mountain Memories, which can help facilitate economic tourism in the area, are the places that need to be most safely preserved. The ability for the place to develop a sustainable economy depends upon the natural space (the mountains) and, as such, the destruction of the mountains, destroys community, culture, and the economic landscape.

Beyond pointing to specific spots of preservation related to the economy, the map also uses specific sites in place to act as prognostic framing related to the community history of the area. For example, the map points to the standing stones at “Walden's Ridge, TN” to act as a place that can be preserved and, thus, assist in preserving the community history and cultural heritage of the area. The stones are described as a place that was used for community meetings during the Pilgrim's time and still, to this day, acts as a convergent space for local citizens. As such, it is a place that acts as a symbol of the community history and social relations inscribed in the local landscape. As the narrator of the video, Wanda Hodge, states:

Right next to the mine sites are the standing stones...the standing stones are of great significance. Many, many years ago, we've heard stories that pioneers used to hold square dancing around the standing stones, they used to have picnics and church meetings there...blasting in the area could topple those standing stones and they could roll into the valley below.

Thus, the precision by which place is framed in terms of community and culture facilitates a prognostic of place that presents precise places as capable of being maintained so as to maintain community history. Indeed, place is used to prognosis change “from below.”

Third, certain mountains are chosen as prognostic places for promoting an alternative future based upon alternative energy. At Coal River Mountain, the caption reads: “But residents in the Coal River Valley have joined together to propose a new idea – one of sustainable energy. In 2006, a study of the wind potential on Coal River Mountain demonstrated that the mountain is an ideal location for developing utility-scale wind power.” Wind energy is seen as a way to preserve the landscape, as it requires the mountainous landscape to remain intact, and in preserving the landscape also preserve the economic and cultural dimensions of place. For instance, the video provides text that states “The Coal River Mountain Wind Farm will preserve mountain ridges, provide permanent jobs, and keep energy dollars in the community.” Coal River Valley, in being chosen as an example of a place-based prognosis for the future is powerful as the place is capable of offering meanings associated with alternative energy, cultural history, and the community economy. A related prognostic place is Black Mountain in Lynch, KY. Here, the place is used as a site of possible preservation as it is redolent with meanings associated with organizing for social change, economic tourism and renewable energy: “In the past two decades, Harlan County residents have joined together to protect the upper parts of Black Mountain” which includes “efforts to develop cultural heritage tourism. Many are also working to develop renewable energy resources.”

Finally, the last site mentioned as a precise place where preservation can begin is Blair Mountain, WV. At Blair Mountain, the point of preservation is to illustrate that the mountains can be saved by focusing on the national history they contain. The argument for this place is “if we preserve this mountain, this place, we also preserve national public memory.” Like the USHMM map, which restricted public memory to local human rights abuse, Appalachian Voices also constructs the public memory of place in light of conflict, but it is an inherently optimistic and positive conflict that implicates the entire history, identity and prominent myths of America within its scope. The memory of Blair Mountain creates an association with historical culture that not only belongs to the local, but also to the nation as well. The caption underneath the video for Blair Mountain reads as follows:

Blair Mountain, West Virginia is the site of the 1921 Battle of Blair Mountain, the historic push of unionized coal miners from the north to organize the workers of the southern coalfields. Involving 13,000 union miners and 2,000 anti-union defenders, the battle was the largest armed conflict in America since the civil war! It remains literally a battleground: a prime location for finding historic artifacts left from both sides of the conflict. It’s also, however, a battleground between opponents of mountaintop removal coal mining and the coal companies and the coal companies themselves.

Here, then, the public memory associated with Blair Mountain is a memory of national unionizing and organizing for social change. The physical landscape contains public

memories of organizing battles, particularly as it literally contains the physical artifacts of that battle in the landscape as people often find old bullets, coat buttons or other unionizing antiques. Thus, this site represents a prognostic vision of collective action based upon preserving public memory through the maintenance of cultural heritage. The narrator of the video encourages action on behalf of national heritage, saying “the best thing you can do is call your politicians, representatives.” At Blair Mountain, we can see both the diagnostic place-frame (national memory and history is naturalized into the landscape) and the prognostic place-frame (Blair Mountain is a specific site that can be preserved to preserve public memory). But, however, it also gives us insight into the motivational place-frame of this organizational discourse: implications of the global into the local through a sense of place.

Motivational Framing: Everyone in Place

The problem diagnosed is that the mountainous landscape nurtures community, contains complex histories, and is a landscape of family stories, what Tuan (1976) would call “rootedness,” and mountaintop removal presents the death of the landscape and, by association, the death of those memories and dimensions of life. The prognostic place-frame is that there are specific sites in that battle which can be networked to organize different SMOs. These networked places can also provide a geographical framework highlighting those community histories, national public memories, or potential for a positive economic and energy-based future. By organizing for these specific sites, it allows the organizations to also organize for these themes tied to the landscape. Overall, through a focus on these places, the prognostic place-frame is built around a preservation

of places through this four-tiered solution: renewable energy, tourist economies, preservation of community culture and national memories, all which can occur by contacting local place-based organizations. Finally, the last component is facilitating motivation. In this case, the motivational place-frame is very much oriented around a sense of place: the generation of a sense of place for outsiders and the reinforcement of a sense of place for local activists. The first occurs by way of implicating a user into local place and “exhorting them to act” on its behalf and the second by way of addressing multiple and competing histories of the place and foregrounding that which offers the most positive sense of place for local action against mountaintop removal mining.

Implicating the Outsider: Physical and Emotional Connection to Place. First, place is used by Appalachian Voices to motivate action by constructing a *physical* connection to the local landscape. That is, the videos quite explicitly attempt to extend their place (which the user is viewing from Google Earth) to Google auditors living in the United States. For instance, turning towards the caption regarding Daymon Morgan that began the discussion of Appalachian Voices’ map, it is clear how the local place can be expanded in such a way as to constitute more individuals within its scope. After diagnosing the problem as associated with the alteration to place occurring from the hand of mountaintop removal, the caption then attempts to associate all individuals with that place. For instance, the caption states

Morgan’s fear isn’t just for the streams, or the trees, the deer or the wild turkeys, the ginseng or the bloodroot. It’s for his family and friends; their

health and safety. And he fears for the welfare of all of us who, let's face it, live downstream.

The recognition that “we all live downstream” is the prime motivation to act in this frame. Instead of using place to simply supplement the global, the Appalachian Voices map attempts to bring an individual to the local and then extend that local place further into the global (or, at least, the national sphere).

This is further exemplified throughout in illustrating a Google Earth user's connection to the locality through the extension of physical space. For instance, at Gauley, WV, one individual states that mountaintop removal

fills in the valleys, drains in on this side to the Gauley River which meets with the New River, forms the Conococheague, goes to the Ohio River, which empties into the Mississippi. So we're, in effect, cutting half of the water supply off, or dirtying it in some way, for half of the United States.

The outside individual is intricately connected to the physical landscape of the Appalachian Mountains. The waterways that are connected to mountaintop removal sites are intertwined with waterways around the world. Thus, these videos mapped onto the Google Earth virtual earth attempt to implicate the virtual auditor into their locality. By tracing the physical waters from Appalachia into the rest of the United States (a trail which the virtual Google Earth auditor can literally follow from their “objectivist” standpoint), the map attempts to gather motivation from those outside of the place by building a recognition of interconnectedness.

Of course, along with the extension of the physical space, comes an extension of the emotional place, accomplished through the potential development of a sense of place within the Google Earth auditor. In extending the physical space – the rivers and waterways – to people outside of their region, it also may be possible to extend the meanings attached to those physical spaces (the locals’ sense of place). As I have shown so far, most of the videos openly discuss the nature of their sense of place – the extent to which the local individuals feels like he or she belongs, or is rooted, in place – and ask the auditor to experience much of that with them. Indeed, it is nearly impossible to browse this map and not recognize what the green, rolling hills viewed on Google Earth mean to the local citizens in the area in terms of community, family, and culture. Thus, focusing so much on a sense of place is grounds for an implicit invitation into their meaning-making symbols that organize the landscapes viewed on Google Earth.

Of course, these are coupled with explicit calls for the global auditor to enter the local place through organizations or other local action. For instance, at the end of the Gauley Mountain, WV video, a local individual encourages an entrance of the global into the local: “And if there’s any folks out there who’d like to help, we’d love to have you. Come to Ansted, West Virginia.” The means by which the outsider can be mobilized is by entering the local place; by forfeiting their connection to the global. This is reinforced in the explicit calls for prognostic action by joining local place-based organizations such as *Kentuckians for the Commonwealth* and *Southern Appalachian Mountain Stewards*. Through the stories and a sense of place, and the organizations that embody them, the

global (or national) auditor is quite literally invited to join the local place and act on its behalf “from below.”

Blair Mountain, WV also gives insight into the motivational place-frame. This is a unique version of extending emotional, meaning-laden place out to non-local Google Earth auditors. Not only is the physical space extended to the user through Google Earth’s virtual medium, but so are some specific meanings and histories of local place.³ The place of Blair Mountain, and its associated memory, is especially useful for calling the Google Earth user to action. The extension of this place to the Google Earth user implicates the user in light of a memory of organizing for social change. The place is important not only because it contains a sense of place for local citizens, but because developing a sense of place in association with that mountain also amounts to developing a sense of place regarding labor disputes and unionizing national history. Identifying with the landscape may amount to identifying with the subject position that defines organized action. Since Blair Mountain is the site of a “national historical conflict,” association with this landscape extends the public memory of the local to those who may otherwise reside outside of the region, or who reside within the region but are otherwise not drawn to organized action against mountaintop removal mining. In short, identifying with Blair Mountain helps identify individuals with a motive to engage in collective action.

While Blair Mountain, West Virginia is the most extended treatment, this is reinforced throughout the map. Different places are highlighted to implicate the place inhabitant into memories of organizing for social change. For instance, at Walden’s Ridge, Tennessee, the place is embedded with social change inscriptions:

“Wanda and her community have good reason to be proud of what this area still is. Twenty years ago, they banded together and successfully fought coal companies who saw a large profit in mining the Sewanee Coal Seam which runs through Walden’s Ridge...Wanda and her community won a “Lands Unsuitable for Mining” designation for Rock Creek Watershed, which is part of Walden’s Ridge and this has kept this area safe for the past 20 years.”

The place itself has been maintained by a public past of organizing for social change. At Black Mountain, Kentucky the caption states that “In the past two decades, Harlan County residents have joined together to protect the upper parts of Black Mountain from logging and mountaintop removal.” The public memory of place is constructed to implicate inhabitant into a history of successful collective action.

Reinforcing the Insider: Addressing Competing Place Meanings. So far, the motivational frame has just focused on the means by which the local attempts to implicate the global auditor into the goals and meanings of local collective action. However, the movement against mountaintop removal relies tremendously on action “from below” against the unchecked free-market pursuit of profit (mountaintop removal mining). Thus, it also requires motivating those individuals living in the region. Certainly, there are moments in the maps of Appalachian Voices that seem to explicitly attempt to motivate local citizens.

Perhaps most clearly, the maps attempt to address competing meanings and histories of place, so as to help individuals in the region alleviate a tension that may inhibit them from engaging in action against the coal companies. Specifically, they have

to attend to multiple histories of place, public memories of coal employment, landscape-based heritage, and fear of losing what few jobs exist. Some of the videos, in naturalizing community and culture into place, give great respect to the coal company/citizen relationship (outside of mountaintop removal) that constructed the community and place. Many state phrases such as “I’m not against coal mining, or anything” before entering a criticism of mountaintop removal practices. These strategies, it might be argued, are the first attempts at using the local place to create a motivational place-frame for the local citizens. In reinforcing the local sense of place for the region, they also have to reinforce, and not threaten, the coal-inspired place meanings. The place of Appalachia is defined by competing tensions. These different place-histories must be managed by the collective in order to engage in organized action.

There are a number of other strong examples on the map. I explained earlier that the Benham and Lynch piece details the explicit creation of the community and waterways by two different coal companies. In tying the waterways (natural environment) to a coal-inspired history, the icon works to mend those two place-based histories. As such, advocacy for place is not derailed by allegiance to the coal industry. The icon located at Gauley, West Virginia, states that “the coal company that was here...made us a bustling community.” Indeed, the sense of place that is developed in light of the motivational place-frame attempts to both acknowledge and undermine the extensive and complex relationship with coal companies in the place.

One extended example worth mentioning occurs at “Coal River Mountain, WV.” After texts on the screen state “The Coal River Mountain wind farm will keep energy

dollars in the local community,” the video addresses the conflicting concerns of local citizens. The video enters a meeting of activists discussing on which mountains the mountaintop removal is going to occur. One individual then addresses the competing concerns over a coal-based economy and activism: “But everybody around here works on them strip mining jobs – and you’re gonna make everybody mad.” The lead activist featured in the video responds, “well, we’re letting people know that this is a project to produce renewable energies and to produce jobs...and they can still mine the coal, they can still go underground to get it.” Here, we explicitly see the two main dimensions of place featured in the prognosis frame (economic concerns and renewable energy) used to reinforce motivated commitment from the local citizens in the region whose sense of place is developed from competing place-meanings. In an explicit call to local citizens, the video states “this is my life...we want this wind farm to happen...what can we do – what are you going to do about it?” The motivation that is extended to the local citizens is predicated upon a need to maintain place while still adhering to the traditional meanings that have constructed the place – those associated with the coal companies.

The Overall Use of Place by Appalachian Voices

Thus, the overall place-frame used by Appalachian Voices, which I have titled the “denaturalizing community” place-frame, can be explained in the following way: The diagnostic place-frame presents the mountains and rivers of the landscape as naturally tied to the nourishment of local culture, community, family history and heritage. Mountaintop removal, in threatening the existence of the mountains and rivers, threatens the existence of these features of local place-based life. The prognostic place frame

argues that in order to counteract this, auditors can pinpoint the precise sites, places and mountains that can be preserved so as to preserve the heritage. In doing so, the place should be focused on the economic and energy-based features of the landscape which can help preserve the landscape through a tourism-based economy, the promotion of renewable energy, and the maintenance of community and national history. Finally, the motivational place-frame presents two different arguments regarding the auditor's relationship to place. For auditors outside of the region, the maps motivate action by physically and emotionally connecting individuals to the Appalachian landscape. For insiders, you should act because the narratives of the place do not have to be competing. You can still find energy-based employment while preserving the cultural heritage that the mountains nourish.

Thus, to again answer RQ1, place is used by Appalachian Voices in order to motivate collective action for both national (and perhaps global) and local citizens. Place is used to promote the maintenance of the landscape through the promotion of renewable energy, tourism economies, and the preservation of community and national history. When place is used to motivate action from the outsiders, with this frame, it is not done so to energize their global affiliation (as it is with the maps produced by the USHMM) but instead to constitute the actors as a part of the local. The local is extending to the global to create identification with the local by Google Earth users. Overall, instead of using place to promote interfering action on the part of the global world, the local place is instead used to promote action from the local to the global. Thus, this seems to truly be a

resistant use of place, more representative of a place-framing suitable for “globalization from below.”

Dialectical Tensions of Place and Google Earth

Through the preceding analysis of place-framing, it seems there are some dialectical tensions associated with how both place is created in terms of establishing its local population and using Google Earth to organize that local place. Thus, the final objective of this chapter is to briefly outline some dialectical tensions that seem to have influenced these uses of place, particularly as they relate to using the medium of Google Earth. There are two different tensions that are embedded in the analysis of these place-frames that can shed insight onto the tensions that may either guide the use of new media in general or these organizing activities specifically: (a) the objectivity/subjectivity of place and (b) the victimization/agency dialectical tension.

Objectivity/Subjectivity of Place

First, in both framings of place, there seemed to be an inherent tension between placing the importance of experiencing place on an objective or subjective experience with the landscape. That is, the simultaneous use of Google Earth, while also focusing on place-making discourses (which, as Tuan (1979) says, must be experienced from the people who have given meaning to place) creates an inherent tension. Both Google Earth and the subjective meaning-making processes of the local individual become important framing resources for these counter-mapping texts and their organizations. Google Earth presents a thesis of objectivity, as the way place is viewed is dependent upon a vast, transnational satellite network, the technology of which is nearly untraceable, and an

author is even more impossible to find. Who took the images of the virtual earth transplanted on the computer screen which shows volcanoes, or rivers, or mountaintop removal sites? The answer to that question is difficult to answer as Google does not own most of the images; they are just purchased from other satellite owners. Google Earth presents a technologically-created place that screams objectivity. However, every one of the maps relies heavily, in one form or the other, on the narrative accounts or images of someone's perception of place. The World is Witness map explicitly asks the auditor to experience the place in light of Michael Graham's subjective view of place. The Crisis in Darfur map relies on the photographic images of many celebrities and the narrative accounts of victimization from local citizens. The Appalachian Voices' map relies heavily on videos that highlight a local individual, or two, who subjectively view place as the resource for their community. Indeed, there seems to be a tension between what Google Earth presents and place.

However, both have to exist to understand the draw of Google Earth for these organizations. For instance, the USHMM uses the "objective" view of Google Earth to give evidence to its claims of naturalized injustice and local victimization. That is, while it offers a narrative account or a photographic image of a local citizen, it also relies on images of the virtual earth to evidence its claims about the Panzi Hospital, or Goma, or other sites of natural injustice. For instance, the World is Witness' "Goma on the Edge" explicitly draws resources from the presence of a volcano on the earth's surface just next to the icon. Similarly, the icon entitled "Horror and Hope at Panzi Hospital" draws part of its rhetorical resources from the view of a number of different small, rectangular houses

viewed from the “sky.” Perhaps most prominently, the Crisis in Darfur map offers a historical view of the landscape wherein the Google Earth satellite imagery is changed to reflect changes in landscape throughout time. However, while it seems to be objective, it is still subjectively created to only reflect a public memory of injustice. Also, the Appalachian Voices’ map often presents the place-framing rhetoric right next to the image of a mountaintop removal site viewed on Google Earth. Thus, all of these images draw part of their resources from a view of the earth mediated by an expanse of technology and satellites, to which a subject human author is nearly untraceable. However, these images are only used to provide evidence of the subjective account of citizens, the organization, or its travel journalists. That is, the objective image is useless unless it is used to provide the grounds for the subjective account of place.

Though the two maps present inherently different uses and motives of place, they still both present the experience of place through human beings directly next to the technologically created view of earth offered by Google Earth. The World is Witness Map focuses on the eyes of the individual as a way to mobilize the heroic global resources of the global world. The Crisis in Darfur map focuses on brief captions and narratives of victimization from the voices of local citizens. The Appalachian Voices map presents the explicit features of community, culture and family as a way to experience place. They rely heavily on a subjective sense of place to mobilize the Google Earth auditor. Be it through family, local culture, victimization, or literally by looking into human eyes, all of these different mapping icons invent the framing of place from the resources offered from a subjective perspective on place.

Thus, the first tension that seems to characterize the use of place by counter-mapping organizations on Google Earth is between presenting the place from the perspective of objectivity while still maintaining ultimate allegiance to the importance of subjective individuals and their experience in place. The objective imagery of Google Earth is, perhaps ironically, only useful when used as evidence of subjective claims. In Castells' (2009) terms, the tension is a matter of being positioned at the intersection of the spaces of flows and the spaces of places; between the supposedly objective networked resources of the global world and the empathy drawn from the localized perspective of the eyes, culture, stories, and photographs of individuals.

The different organizations, through their framing of place, seem to manage this tension differently. For the USHMM, this tension is the exact tension, in the naturalized injustice place-frame, that is necessary for motivating collective action in a global world. That is, the placement of the individual in light of Google Earth, its vast technologies, and supposedly objective illumination of local injustice, may make an auditor aware of global resources. Meanwhile, the subjectivity of the victims' eyes is used to reinforce the global subject position as one of distanced witnessing and empathy. On the crisis in Darfur map, subjective accounts of victimization are mapped onto the objective landscape from a safe global distance, where differences in locality remain vague and seemingly unimportant. Thus, what is first important is the objective gaze upon the earth. However, this is only rhetorically powerful when supplemented by subjective accounts. On the other hand, Appalachian Voices, through the "de-naturalized community" place-frame, manages this tension by implicating the global into the local, expanding the

locality, and its sense of place, to those outside of the region. The subjective account of place (the local account) is used to disrupt the auditor's distance from the locality.

However, it still relies on the objective view when presenting views of mountaintop removal sites, but this is only important when the subjective, meaning-making processes of place inform us that the mountaintop removal site viewed from our objective perspective will destroy community, culture, family, and local/national heritage.

Victimization/Agency Dialectic

There is a second tension present within these various place-framings. This is oriented around the representation of people-in-place. If place is always to be understood from "the perspective of those who have given it meaning" (Tuan, 1979), then all framings of place come with implicit assumptions about local people-in-place. In trying to organize the global auditor of Google Earth, and perhaps the local citizen as well, there is an inherent tension related to the representation of place-based people as victims of the place or agents for change. That is, in order to ask for help from national or global auditors of Google Earth, the organizations have to represent the individuals as some sort of victims. There has to be some sort of diagnosis in association with place and, as a result, those who reside in place are inherently victimized. However, if organizations are also going to attempt to mobilize the local "from below," they still have to maintain some sense of agency for the local citizens. In creating the people as complete victims, this removes all agency. Yet if there is no problem, no sense of injustice, then there is no reason to organize. However, if the individuals are given too much agency to make their own future, there is no sense for the Google Earth auditor to assist in this struggle.

This tension is managed in different ways by the different organizations and their counter-mapping activities on Google Earth. The place-framing performed by the maps of the USHMM seem to reduce inherently (particularly, with the Crisis in Darfur map) the role of the local citizen to that of timeless and vague victim. Thus, it falls on the extreme of this dialectic, which results in a use of place that seems to only organize collective action from global citizens. In “naturalizing injustice” in place, and suggesting change must come from the interfering actions of the global world, the local people of the place are denied change-related agency “from below.” On the other hand, the Appalachian Voices map attempts to manage this a bit more carefully. Place is used for collective action as not only the place of victimization, but also hope in maintaining culture, community, and goodwill. There are competing narratives here. While inevitably, a diagnosis of destruction to place entails narratives of victimization to people, these are presented as unnatural. Instead, what is natural for this place is a sense of community and culture, which offers hope and promise and offers a prognosis focusing on specific mountains that can counteract the dominant hegemony of profit-driven mountaintop removal. This allows them to discuss victimization in place, but to also place a great deal of agency on the local citizens. Overall, part of the reason for using Google Earth as a medium for social change is to promote further action on the part of the global or national citizens, then there has to remain some sense of inability for the local place to do it on its own.

Overall, in response to RQ2, there are at least two tensions defining this case study in organizing for social change: the objective and subjectivity of place and the

representation of people-in-place as victims or agency-oriented. The way that these are managed seems to differ by organization and place-frame, but both counter-mapping initiatives seem characterized by them. While this does not get to every tension experienced by these organizations, it does hopefully provide a heuristic opening for analyzing future dialectal tensions associated with organizing for social change and the use of place as a motivating feature for diagnosing problems, offering solutions and motivating collective action.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I provided my analysis of the place-framing activities performed by two organizations using Google Earth to counter-map for social change: the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and Appalachian Voices. These two organizations present inherently different goals, visions, and purposes for social change. As such, I argued that they offered two different insights into how place can be used to organize for social change. These two frames, I argued, were the naturalized injustice frame and the de-naturalized community place-frame.

I first illustrated the naturalized injustice place-frame which pervades the mapping discourses produced by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. I suggested that the representation of place in this frame is primarily accomplished by way of naturalizing injustice into the physical landscape and suggesting there is no other way for the local place to be read than by victimization. This leads to a prognosis oriented around global interference into place, which is motivated by the subject position of witness. This subject position involves both having seen local injustice in geographies, and also an

awareness of one's global resources and, thus, his or her global responsibility. Thus, overall, place seems to be created to organize social change not for local citizens, but global "witnesses."

Second, I outlined the use of the de-naturalized community place-frame used by Appalachian Voices in its "Most Endangered Mountains Video Series" map. On this map, a network of places and sites constructs the problem as a threat to the community, culture, and social relations that are embedded in the landscape. As such, the prognosis related to ways to preserve the landscape including focusing on natural economic and energy-based solutions. The prognostic frame also specifically focused on particular points in the landscape that directly serve as battleground sites and representation of their vision for the future. These included Coal River Mountain, Blair Mountain, and Gauley Mountain. I maintained that the motivational place-frame used by Appalachian Voices both implicates national or global citizens into the locality and reinforces the adherence of local citizens by addressing competing histories in the landscape.

Finally, I presented two dialectic tensions that may guide research into place and organizing for social change in the future. Using the insights gathered from my place-frame analysis, I argued that there may be two tensions that seem to influence both place-frames although the two different mapping organizations managed them differently. The first seemed inherent to Google Earth itself and was a tension between objectively and subjectively experiencing place. The second tension dealt with the representation of people-in-place and focused on characterizing the place-based populations as victims, while still offering them some sense of agency for social change.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Mapping has an ability to use place for organizing for social change in a number of different and interesting ways. With increases in the presence of geographically-oriented media, counter-maps are likely to become increasingly more important for organizations attempting to counteract global domination. Maps such as those analyzed in this thesis offer the opportunity to create *place* in such a way as to link together sites on a common theme such as victimization, mountain-based culture, global collective action, or renewable energy. The interactive maps analyzed on the Google Earth medium have illustrated the specific means by which place is used to mobilize individuals from local place to global space. Analyzing these map-based uses of place for social change also offers theoretical and practical issues for consideration when organizing for social change in the future.

In this final chapter, I offer implications regarding the analysis of these counter-maps. I focus this chapter around three subjects of implications. The first is theoretical implications. Here, I discuss the means by which this thesis has contributed to the discussions outlined in chapter 2. This is followed by a discussion of directions for future research as, inevitably, this thesis should prompt more questions than answers. Finally, I offer some practical considerations. That is, if counter-mapping and the use of Google Earth are likely to increase in the future, one must be able to practically recognize the benefits of counter-mapping as place-framing. In offering an analysis of the strategies outlined here, and their potential for disrupting hegemonic, global rationalities, I hope to provide just that.

Theoretical Implications

In this thesis, I have expanded upon research that occurs at the intersection of critical geography and organizational communication studies. I started to fill the research void that exists in both the body of work on organizing for global social change and that which exists in the work of place that transcends many disciplines. In illustrating how organizing collectives may use place as a strategy for organizing for social change on a global database, I have expanded on the implications of using place for motivating global organizational action. Specifically, I have offered an account of how place can be created to supply a vision for collective action by diagnosing problems, offering prognostic solutions, and positioning subjects in relationship to place such that they are motivated to act. In doing so, I have offered another account of place-framing to supplement that of Martin (2004). I have attempted to illustrate the differences in place-framing when attempting to organize global auditors and when organize the local “from below.” Thus, researchers using collective action framing as a guiding perspective, and organizational scholars looking at strategies for communicating with global audiences, particularly as these are concerned with space and place, may find heuristic value in this thesis.

Second, I offered some insight into the means by which counter-mapping can be seen as a form of place-framing. This is particularly useful when looking at the creation of place on the virtual earth. Focusing on maps as organizing discourses offered the chance to specifically look at a globalized version of place-framing. As many scholars agree, places of injustice and resistance are “woven” together in complicated forms during globalization (Routledge, & Cumbers, 2009). This thesis has expanded on

research that looks at the means by which these associated places of resistance can be woven together on a common theme for organizing. Looking at counter-maps as place-framing has offered an account of organizing for social change during the complicated, networked places of global resistance.

Third, this thesis contributes to the increased development of research that focuses on non-traditional organizations (organizing). That is, I have shown the importance of place and geography to alternative organizing activities. While this research did not illustrate explicitly organizations working to counteract neo-liberalism, as Osterweil (2009) explains, the battle against globalization involves more than just the most visible anti-neo-liberal events, but also the disparate collection of place-based organizations working to present their view of the world “from below.” In focusing on one organization with explicit global, transnational goals (USHMM), and another with a “place-based” orientation (AV), I have addressed concerns by Ganesh et al. (2005) that organizational communication scholars have not fully attended to the dynamics of global organizing. In contrasting the USHMM and AV, I have illustrated the importance of looking beyond a simple focus on place, to the particulars by which place is created in correspondence with movement symbol use in order to determine its potential for resistance from “below.”

Fourth, I also have expanded on work looking at organizational dialectics. While most of this work is interested in the specific dialectics that are managed by organizational members or leaders, addressed through interviews, much less of this work explicitly addresses the tensions as they are structured in organizational discourse. That is, little work on organizational dialectics explicitly addresses how they surface in

organizational texts. Furthermore, no work has specifically analyzed the dialectics associated with the three main dimensions addressed in this thesis: (1) surveillance technology, (2) place, and (3) counter-mapping for social change. In using Google Earth and counter-mapping as my core site of analysis, I have provided initial insight into all three of these issues as they relate to research in organizational communication.

Finally, this research should open up new lines of discussion on Google Earth and its potential for social change. Much more needs to be said on this topic and its related issue, counter-mapping. However, I have shown that Google Earth, as a site of counter-mapping, does open up a number of geography-based inventive possibilities for organizing collectivities. That is, the resources offered by Google Earth's "objective" gaze and its ability to position videos, narratives, and photographs, or detail public imagery and memory in the landscape, is actively utilized by organizations for the creation of place in a number of different ways. I have also illustrated that there are specific tensions that infect Google Earth in general.

Directions for Future Research

In expanding upon research, this thesis also opens a few lines of future inquiry. There are a number of theoretical issues for consideration by future scholars. These further questions are divided around specific themes and issues: ethical, dialectic, memory-based, and place and social change.

Ethical Questions

First, the use of place on Google Earth prompts some precise ethical questions to be taken up by future analyses of place, social movement activism, and Google Earth.

The analysis of the naturalized injustice frame offered a certain concern for the ethical creation of place from space. The transformation of space to place is a rhetorical process and all rhetorical processes include ethical questions. In this case, the creation of local place by USHMM offered a question regarding the construction of local place to exclude action from local citizens. The places of oppression on the USHMM map are not used to organize collective action on the part of the local individuals, but instead the local place is merely created for a global, western citizen. There is no concern for using place to motivate the actions of those who create, and possess a strong sense of the place. Indeed, future research should address at least one major ethical question that can be phrased in a few ways: “When does the representation of local place as naturally victimized and oppressed by those with global power become an unethical representation of geographies and people-in-place?” In other words, “What are the ethical dimensions of using local place to motivate not local citizens, but the globally powerful?” This question, of course, is magnified by Google Earth as the use of satellite imagery to frame place for action increases those digital divides that reify global inequalities.

Dialectic-Based Questions

Second, future research should expand upon the brief analysis of dialectics outlined in this thesis. First, more research needs to be done on the dialectical tensions associated with using local place for global and local collective action. I pointed to a dialectic that seemed to not only influence the place-framing of these organizations, but also Google Earth in general: the dialectic oriented around placing emphasis on subjective and objective views of place. Future research can not only find new ways to

express this tension in place-based research, and in other forms of counter-mapping or on Google Earth, but also illustrate how organizations can effectively manage this tension in a number of social change contexts.

Furthermore, the victimization/agency tension deals with the relationship between geography and the essentialist view of people-in-place. Critical geographers have long lamented the view that people naturally, or essentially, belong to a certain place, or that a certain place naturally defines a group of people. This, they argue, is problematic as it constructs place as the site of oppressive identities asserting that the victim will always be defined by a given place, or that she or he inherently belongs there. This, however, is a precise tension for those using place to organize for social change through geography. How is one to construct victimization without naturalizing or essentializing it into a particular place and restricting agency? Nevertheless, agency must be restricted to some extent if the place is to be used to suggest global adherents need to assist in the place-based struggle. Further analysis of this tension, and its successful management in place-based campaigns, could shed light on future social change endeavors.

Memory-Based Research

One quite unexpected element that emerged from this thesis was what seems to be a very important element of public memory. While public memory has for sometime been viewed as important to constructing place and its attendant meanings (Blair, & Michel, 1999; Dickinson, 1997; Said, 2000), it also appears to play a role in the way place can be used for social change. That is, with the Crisis in Darfur map, as well as the Blair Mountain, WV icon on the Appalachian Voices map, public memory was vital in

positioning auditors to act on behalf of the place. With the Crisis in Darfur map, it was a matter of presenting a view of the landscape as only defined by local injustice.

Meanwhile, with Blair Mountain, it was a matter of presenting place as defined by a public memory of organizing for social change so as to construct a sense of place for auditors that inherently positions them to action. In both of these cases, it is clear that place is able to navigate a public memory in ways that are suitable for the movement campaign. Future research should attend more carefully to the different views of place and public memory that influence a given geography and attempt to define it for different hegemonic or social change purposes. In other words, how is a particular movement or organization re-memorializing place for the purposes of subversive collective action?

Research on Google Earth

Another potential area for increased theoretical commitment rests in the perspectives taken on Google Earth. Future research should attend to the meanings, uses, and attendant ethical and dialectical issues that surround Google Earth. I have attempted to point to a few dialectical tensions that characterize those social change strategies utilizing Google Earth. However the communicative potential to infect meanings and change through surveillance technology needs to be further addressed. The goal and perspective of this thesis, for instance, did not allow for a fully postmodern perspective on Google Earth to emerge. Certainly, Baudrillard (1990) who finds that “what fascinates everyone is the debauchery of signs, that reality, everywhere and always, is debauched by signs” (p. 100), and that this fascination is what moves society forward, would have something to say about the claim to “objectivity” offered by Google Earth. Perhaps

Google Earth is the complete subservience of place-based realities to the world of transcendental signs? If so, is there any hope for place-based social change?

Place and Organizing for Social Change

More research should address the theoretical connections between place and organizing for social change. There is a rich interdisciplinary engagement that needs to occur between scholars interested in critical geography and scholars interested in non-traditional analyses of organizational communication. Some work needs to expand upon the relevance of place and organizational communication discourses as they are specifically facilitated through mapping texts. I have attempted to begin this discussion, but there are a very large number of organizations currently using maps for the purposes of “globalization from below.” The theoretical implications of using mapping texts to link organizational communication and critical geography need to be further addressed.

Furthermore, other work needs to deal with how place is used for organizing for social change in more material forms. While this work has expanded upon these uses of place for organizing for social change on the virtual world, there needs to be specific analyses of change-oriented movements and what they bring to material city streets or urban centers. How can the material landscapes around us be used for globally subversive purposes? Indeed, the work of De Certeau (1984) might be most useful here as a launching point.

While this thesis has attempted to point to the use of place by organizations looking to mobilize individuals to some sort of change-oriented collective action, future research also needs to address the use of place for the purposes of global hegemony.

Critical organizational communication scholars would be well advised to follow Harvey's (1993) lead and look at how dominant global organizations use place to hide labor disputes and how the landscape itself then comes to contain the codes to such disputes. As this research has shown, more dominant global organizations are capable of creating local place in such a way as to promote global dominance and interference. Future scholars can attend to the means by which the World Bank, for instance, networks or maps the meanings of a number of local places to present them as commensurate with the hegemonic ideological tenants of free market globalization. Also, research can look into other very well-intentioned organizations, such as the USHMM, that inadvertently may use local place in such a way as to adhere to the mandates of hegemonic global assumptions.

Practical Contributions

This thesis also offers moments of consideration for individuals practicing the pursuit of organizing for social change. Many theorists find space and place to be the central feature of global, transnational times (and capitalism) (Jameson, 1991). As such, it is the means by which we transform space into place that come to represent the central concern for organizations contending with the hegemony of globalization. In a world of transnational media, capital, and images, it becomes increasingly important to create local places as sites of resistance and, perhaps, link those places to other networked places in what Castells (2009) calls the "spaces of places." Indeed, local places become the central locus by which the global hegemony can either be allowed to persist or by which they may run into a resistant local place.

Addressing the various strategies analyzed in this thesis can give some insight into what can practically constitute an effectively resistant creation of place. As Ganesh et al. (2005) suggest, one can address the potential of organizing activities for disrupting hegemonic rationalities. Practically, the construction of place is one dimension that can be consciously attended to and managed by organizations to more or less effectively disrupt global hegemony. Not carefully attending to the means by which place is mobilized for action may result in a strict reliance on hegemonic assumptions about localities in a global world.

Such was surely the case with the naturalized injustice place-framing within the maps of the USHMM. The use of the naturalized injustice frame for counteracting hegemonic power seems very little. While its motive is good and honest, and it may present some increases in donations from those using Google Earth, the naturalized injustice place-frame is a use of place for motivating collective action that relies on both hegemonic perceptions of the developed and undeveloped world and relies heavily on the resources of global power for presenting its causes. It also reifies a fundamental belief that, since some localities just naturally experience violence and injustice, that the global flow of information and capital and resources in order to change the location is inherently needed. While this is well-intentioned, the naturalizing injustice frame falls into the ideology which motivates neo-liberal globalization. As such, its practical value for organizing social change seems very little.

On the other hand, the de-naturalized community framing seems to offer place as resistant to global hegemony. First, it presents place as truly a site of resistance to the

unchecked development and pursuit of resources of the global world. It presents the effects of unchecked capitalism (making money off of the most efficient and profitable means of gaining resources – mountaintop removal) as not just aesthetic or even environmental, but destroying the place-based heritage of the locality. By focusing on the positive cultural and community-based dimensions of place, the alteration of local space is constructed as negatively related to global development. By making community natural to the landscape, the landscape presents closed boundaries to the influence of global space. Furthermore, the local place is explicitly used to mobilize local citizens as well as global auditors through their association with local place. This is truly the case where the framing of the landscape, of the mountains, of the people in place, is used to present the rationality “from below” onto the global world and implicate the global world within the rationality of the local place (after all, we are all connected to it).

Following these two different uses of framing place are two different uses of the resources of Google Earth. In both cases, the illuminating potential of Google Earth is utilized to highlight an “objective” view of the diagnosed problem. However, when the subjective creation of place is done so through positive themes (culture, community) as opposed to more negative conceptions of place (injustice, victimization), the objective problem is much more threatening to the place. Google Earth is put to a much stronger use in the objective/subjective dialectic in the de-naturalized community frame as it offers an “objective problem” countered with a “subjective sense of place.” On the other hand, with the naturalized injustice frame, the dialectic is defined by “objective problem” and “subjective injustice,” which cannot offer the subjective perception as counter to the

objective view of the virtual earth. Thus, using Google Earth's objective gaze to run counter to subjective and positive senses of place may be a more effective management of the objective/subjective dialectic.

Thus, one attempting to use counter-mapping, the creation of place and Google Earth for organizing for social change may keep some recommendations in mind: *First, frame the collective action associated with place around de-naturalized community as opposed to naturalized injustice.* When transforming space to place, focus on naturalizing into the landscape those features that offer community and local cultural resources. This offers the chance to present the local as having change-oriented agency, and as being somewhat self-sustaining. Truly, this positions the local "from below" as opposed to a commensurate association with the hegemonic rationalities of extending global space. This also opens up motivational possibilities through an extension of a sense of place as well as more nuanced focuses on prognostic alterations in the landscape. The de-naturalized community offers prognostic places based on specific instances in the landscape that can retain culture and community as opposed to a vague interference into the locality from the global.

Second, appropriately manage the competing tensions between portraying people-in-place as victims or agents for social change. Part of not completely constructing place from space in light of themes of injustice and victimization involves allowing for agency on the behalf of local citizens. While organizing campaigns utilizing global software such as Google Earth are generally doing so to enlist aid from outsiders to the region, if change is to occur from "the place up," it is going to have to provide a

geography of global and local cooperation. Particularly, the local people-in-place need to be provided with agency so that they are motivated to action and the global Google Earth auditors are motivated to assist *on their terms*. Managing this tension is vital as a pure construction of place as nurturing victimized individuals inhibits local action, while too much of a focus on place as nurturing agent-oriented individuals inhibits cooperation with citizens on the national or global scene.

Combined, these two suggestions provide a recommendation that place be constructed from space with a delicate amount of openness and closedness to globalization. On the one hand place cannot be constructed from space wherein meanings are completely open to the encroachment of global spaces. This is the hegemonic rationality of globalization: localities experiencing problems will inherently benefit from openness to the spaces of flows. All localities should allow for the transnational movement of images, capital, and so forth. This is the construction of place that occurs when injustices are naturalized into the landscape and agency is removed from the local citizens. On the other hand, since transnational geographical inequalities are complicatedly persisting, there must be some networked resistance from the local place. Place cannot be completely closed off to its associated geographies of inequalities. Place, also, cannot completely deny its affiliation with outsiders who may assist in the organizing goals. Thus, place needs to both reify its local solidarity, but also construct what Routledge and Cumbers (2009) title “geographies of transnational solidarity.” Therefore, when constructing place from space it is vital to establish a naturalized

community and sense of agency, but also allow for room to establish transnational geographical networked resistance.

In the end, whether Google Earth and mapping texts using its database are effective tools for social change depends upon more than a faithful allegiance to the workings of the media. While Google Earth can offer a chance to “map” the virtual globe and construct place from space, collectives still need to be vitally conscientious towards the means by which those media are used to construct a network of places. The medium both provides the potential for offering new insights into social change and for reifying the tendency to take place as a feature of human life that cannot run counter to the global dominance of the developed world. Indeed, the problems and possibilities regarding the use of places, maps, and new geographically-oriented media are certainly things that should be taken seriously by theorists and practitioners concerned with the pursuit of global and local collective action.

Notes

¹ Analyzing the mapping activities on Google Earth, as I stated in the last chapter, presents some methodological challenges as one has to decide where and when to cut off access to the endlessly hyper-linked web. As I stated, I have chosen to only analyze the organizational discourse that occurs directly on Google Earth for I am interested in the mapping activities associated with the Google Earth Outreach collective and the use of place that resides in it. That said, there are specific links that motivate individuals to take action on the map, but it leads to a hyperlink that distances the user from the place on the virtual Earth. Thus, in only focusing on the prognostic elements of place on Google Earth, associated with the Crisis in Darfur map, it appears that the most tenable feature of the prognostic framing is the experience of place through the perspective of the courageous individual, illuminating naturalized injustice through the tools of the modern world: photography and, of course, Google Earth.

² Interestingly, this image uses the virtual earth as a rhetorical resource for framing the invasion of injustice, using the virtual earth not to highlight what is natural in the place (like the USHMM does with the volcano) but to highlight what is an invasion to the place.

³ In Castells' (1996) terms, this amounts to the extension of the "spaces of places" to indict the user within the "spaces of flows" to engage in the collective action associated with the place.

References

- Alkon, A. H. & Traugot, M. (2008). Place matters, but how: Rural identity, environmental decision making, and the social construction of place. *City and Community*, 7, 97-112.
- Anderson, H. F., & Lamy, F. (2007, June 17). A picture is worth millions of voices. Message posted to <http://google-latlong.blogspot.com>
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture*, 2(2), 1-24.
- Appalachian Voices. (2006). *National memorial for the mountains*. [video]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com>
- Appalachian Voices. (2009). Google Earth files. Retrieved from <http://www.ilovemountains.org/multimedia/#ge>
- Ashcraft, K. L. (2005). Resistance through consent? Occupational identity, organizational form, and the maintenance of masculinity among commercial airline pilots. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19, 67-90.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barney, T. (2009). Power lines: The rhetoric of maps as social change in the post-cold war landscape. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 95, 412-434.
- Baudrillard, J. (2009). *Fatal strategies*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e)
- Bauer, K. (2009). On the politics and the possibilities of participatory mapping and GIS: Using spatial technologies to study common property and land use change among pastoralists in Central Tibet. *Cultural Geographies*, 16, 229-252.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611-639.
- Blair, C., & Michel, N. (1999). Commemorating the theme park zone: Reading the Astronauts Memorial. In T. Rosteck (Ed.). *At the intersection: Cultural studies and rhetorical studies* (pp. 29-83). New York: the Guilford Press.
- Bird, S. E. (2002). It makes sense to us: Cultural identity in local legends of place. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 31, 519-547.
- Brecher, J., Costello, T., & Smith, B. (2000). *Globalization from below: The power of solidarity*. Boston: South End Press.
- Butler, D. (2008). Having fun with Google Earth. *Mathematics Teaching Incorporating Micromath*, 209, 28-30.
- Buttimer, A. (1976). Grasping the dynamism of the lifeworld. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 66, 211-292.
- Cantrill, J. (1998). The environmental self and a sense of place: Communication foundations for regional ecosystem management. *Journal of Applied Communication*, 26, 301-318.
- Castells, M. (2009). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell.
- Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the *Peuple Quebecois*. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 133-150.

- Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Zorn, Jr., T. E., Ganesh, S. (2004). *Organizational communication in an age of globalization: Issues, reflections and practices*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Clark, G. (2004). *Rhetorical landscapes in America: Variations on a theme from Kenneth Burke*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Cloud, D. (2001). Laboring under the sign of the new: Cultural studies, organizational communication, and the fallacy of the new economy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 268-278.
- Cloud, D. (2005). Fighting words: Labor and the limits of communication at Staley, 1993 to 1996. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18, 509-542.
- Crable, R. E. (1990). "Organizational rhetoric" as the fourth great system: Theoretical, critical, and pragmatic implications. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 18, 115-128.
- D'Agnese, F. A. (2007). Utilizing internet-based community collaboration and 3D visualization tools to address issues of water resource sustainability. *Abstracts of the 2007 annual meeting of the Geological Society of America*. Denver, CO, 39(6), 13.
- Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- De Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Wit, C. (1997). *Sense of place on the American high plains*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- Del Casino, V. J., & Hanna, S. P. (2000). Representations and identities in tourism map spaces. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, 23-46.
- Diani, M. (1996). Linking mobilization frames and political opportunities: Insights from regional populism in Italy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 61, 1053-1069.
- Dickinson, G. (1997). Memories for sale: Nostalgia and the construction of identity in Old Pasadena. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 83, 1-27.
- Dickinson, G., Ott, B., & Akoi, E. (2006). Spaces of remembering and forgetting: The reverent eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 3, 27-47.
- Dicum, G. (2007, September/October). Eyes in the sky and on your desktop: With Google Earth, satellite images become an activist's ally. *Sierra*, pp. 58-62.
- Eltantawy, N. (2008). Pots, pans, & protests: Women's strategies for resisting globalization in Argentina. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 5, 46-63.
- Frickel, S. (2004). Building an interdiscipline: Collective action framing and the rise of genetic toxicology. *Social Problems*, 51(2), 61-81.
- Galanes, G. J. (2009). Dialectical tensions of small group leadership. *Communication Studies*, 60, 409-425.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ganesh, S. (2003). Organizational narcissism: Technology, legitimacy, and identity in an Indian NGO. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16, 558-594.

- Ganesh, S., Zoller, H., & Cheney, G. (2005). Transforming resistance, broadening our boundaries: Critical organizational communication meets globalization from below. *Communication Monographs*, 72, 169-191.
- Gibbs, J. (2009). Dialectics in a global software team: Negotiating tensions across time, space and culture. *Human Relations*, 62, 905-935.
- Glass, I. [director/host]. (1998). Maps [radio series episode]. In N. Updike & I. Glass [Producers]. *This American Life*. Chicago, IL: Public Radio International.
- Goffman, I. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Gordon, E. & Koo, G. (2008). Placeworlds: Using virtual worlds to foster civic engagements. *Space and Culture*, 11, 204-221.
- Grossberg, L. (1996). Space and globalization in cultural studies. In I. Chambers & L. Curti (Eds.). *The post-colonial question: Common skies, divided horizons* (pp. 169-188). London: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (1993). Class relations, social justice, and the politics of difference. In M. Pile & S. Pile (Eds.). *Place and the Politics of Identity* (pp. 41-66). New York: Routledge.
- Hays, I., Hughes, A., & Tutton, T. (2004). Monuments, memory, and marginalization in Adelaide's Prince Henry Gardens. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86 B, 201-216.
- Hogdson, D., & Schroder, R.A. (2002). Dilemmas of counter-mapping community resources in Tanzania. *Development and Change*, 33(1), 79-100.
- Hogler, R., Gross, M. A., Hartman, J. L., & Cunlife, A. L. (2008). Meaning in organizational communication: Why metaphor is the cake, not the icing. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21, 393-412.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism: or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jones, M.T. (2007). Google's geospatial organizing principle. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 27(4), 8-13.
- Keith, M., & Pile, S. (1993a). Introduction part 1: The politics of place. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the politics of identity* (pp. 1-21). New York: Routledge.
- Keith, M., & Pile, S. (1993b). Introduction part 2: The place of politics. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the politics of identity* (pp. 22-40). New York: Routledge.
- Kingsbury, J. & Jones, J. P. J. (2009). Walter Benjamin's dionysian adventures on Google Earth. *Geoforum*, 40(4), 1-12.
- Kiyomiya, T. (2007). *Transformation of organizational identity in corporate hegemony: Critical perspectives to Japanese corporate misconduct*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Lagerkvist, A. (2008). Travels in thirdspace: Experiential suspense in mediaspace: The case of the America (un)known. *European Journal of Communication*, 23, 343-363.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The social production of space*. (D. Nicholas-Smith, Trans.) Oxford: Blackwell.

- Loffreda, B. (2007). Scheduling idealism in Laramie, Wyoming. In S. Kolin (Ed.), *Postwestern cultures: Literature, theory and space* (pp. 159-171). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Lund, J. J., & Macklin, S. (2007). *ArcGIS and Google Earth: Rules of engagement*. Paper presented at the 2007 ESRI Education Users Conference. San Diego, CA, 1-13.
- Malone, M. (2007, March 12). *WWF teams up with Google Earth* [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.panda.org/wwf_news/?uNewsID=95920
- Martin, D. G. (2003). "Place-framing" as place-making: Constituting a neighborhood for organizing and activism. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93(3), 730-750.
- Meisenbach, R. J., Remke, R. V., Buzzanell, P. M., & Liu, M. (2008). "They allowed": Pentadic mapping of women's maternity leave discourse as organizational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 75, 1-24.
- Mills, J., Francis, K., & Bonner, A. (2007). The problem of workforce for the social world of Australian rural nurses: A collective action frame analysis. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 15, 721-730.
- Mumby, D. K., & Stohl, C. (2007). (Re)disciplining organizational communication studies: A response to Broadfoot and Munshi. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21, 268-280.
- Noonan, R. K. (1995). Women against the state: Political opportunities and collective action frames in Chile's transition to democracy. *Sociological Forum*, 10, 81-111.
- Norton, T. (2009). Situating organizations in politics: A diachronic view of control-resistance dialectics. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22, 525-554.
- Osterweil, M. (2009). Place-based globalists: Rethinking the global in the alternative globalization movement. *The Counter-Cartographies Collective*. Retrieved from <http://www.countercatographies.org>
- Papa, M. J., Singhal, A., & Papa, W. H. (2006). *Organizing for social change: A dialectic journey of theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parks, L. (2009). Digging into Google Earth: An analysis of Crisis in Darfur. *Geoforum*, 40, 535-545.
- Porta, D. D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: An introduction*. Boston: Blackwell.
- Post, C. (2008). Modifying sense of place in a federal company town: Sunflower Village, Kansas, 1942-1959. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 25, 137-159.
- Pribble, P. (1990). Making an ethical commitment: A rhetorical case study of organizational socialization. *Communication Quarterly*, 38, 255-267.
- Quantic, D. D. (1997). *The nature of the place: A study of Great Plains fiction*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Prasad, A. (2003). (Ed.). *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Relph, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion.
- Rice, J. (2008). Urban mappings: A rhetoric of the network. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 38, 198-218.
- Routledge, P., & Cumbers, A. (2009). *Global justice networks: Geographies of transnational solidarity*. New York: Manchester University Press.

- Said, E. (2000). Invention, memory and place. *Critical Inquiry*, 26, 175-192.
- Sakakibara, C. (2008). "Our home is drowning": Inupiat storytelling and climate change in Point Hope, Alaska. *The Geographical Review*, 98, 456-475.
- Sandberg, S. (2006). Fighting neo-liberalism with neo-liberal discourse: ATTAC Norway, Foucault, and Collective Action Framing. *Social Movement Studies*, 5, 209-227.
- Shome, R. & Hegde, R. S. (2002). Culture, communication, and the challenge of globalization. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19, 172-189.
- Sillince, J. A. A. (2007). Organizational context and the discursive construction of organizing. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 20, 363-394.
- Sletto, B. (2009). "Indigenous people don't have boundaries": Reborderings, fire management, and productions of authenticities in indigenous landscapes. *Cultural Geographies*, 16, 253-277.
- Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real and imagined places*. Boston: Blackwell.
- Stahley, T. (2006). Earth from above. *Science Teacher*, 73(7), 44-48.
- Stewart, J., & Dickinson, G. (2008). Enunciating locality in the postmodern suburb: Flatiron crossing and the Colorado lifestyle. *Western Journal of Communication*, 72, 280-307.
- Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices: Communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 349-407.
- Sutko, D. (2007). Digital plus real equals Whoa!. *Aether: The Journal of Media Geography*, 1, 56-58.
- Taylor, D. E. (2000). The rise of the environmental justice paradigm: Injustice framing and the social construction of environmental discourse. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 508-580.
- Tuan, Y. F. (1976). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tuan, Y. F. (1979). Space and place: Humanistic perspective. In S. Gale & G. Olsson (Eds.), *Philosophy in Geography* (pp. 387-427). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Thrift, N. (2004). Intensities of feeling: Towards a spatial politics of affect. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86B(3), 201-216.
- United States Holocaust Museum (2009). *Mapping initiatives: Be a witness*. Retrieved from <http://www.ushmm.org/maps>.
- Wainwright, J., & Bryan, J. (2009). Cartography, territory, property: Postcolonial reflections on indigenous counter-mapping in Nicaragua and Belize. *Cultural Geographies*, 16(2), 15-178.
- Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1917). *The organization of thought*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Whitmeyer, S. J., De Paor, D. G., & Sharma, A. (2007). Innovative Google Earth visualizations of the Appalachian-Caledonian Orogeny in eastern North America

- and western Ireland. *Abstracts of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Geological Society of America*. Durham, NH, 39(1), 42-43.
- Wood, D. (1992). *The power of maps*. New York: Guilford Press
- Wright, S. (2008). Locating a politics of knowledge: Struggles over intellectual property in the Philippines. *Australian Geographer*, 39(4), 409-426.
- Zagacki, K., & Gallagher, V. J. (2009). Rhetoric and materiality in the museum park at the North Carolina Museum of Art. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 95, 171-191.
- Zoller, H. (2004). Dialogue as global issue management: Legitimizing corporate influence in the Transatlantic Business Dialogue. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18, 204-240.